







# THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

VOL. VII.—APRIL, 1882.—No. 26.

---

## THE RELIGIOUS RIGHTS OF CATHOLICS IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

THERE is a general impression that religious liberty exists in the United States, and that every one is free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. This is, however, a fallacy. The Constitution of the United States does not guarantee any such liberty; it simply declares that Congress shall make no law establishing any religion or prohibiting the free exercise of any. And the Supreme Court of the United States, in a case originating in New Orleans, decided that the Constitution does not prevent a State from having an established religion.<sup>1</sup> Each one of the United States may have an established church, as Massachusetts had in the early part of this century. An amendment to the Constitution of the United States, introduced some years ago by Mr. Blaine, would have gone further and have taken this power absolutely from the States. Had the amendment been adopted it would, if construed fairly and honorably, have dealt a death-blow to the "Protestant religion" as the official State religion in many parts of the country.

No term, perhaps, is more abused than that of religious freedom. When a Catholic hears some orator in bombastic period and turgid phrase laud to the skies the founders of New England as advocates of religious liberty, when, in fact, they openly denounced toleration as evil and enforced uniformity with the halter; when he hears New Netherland claimed as a home of religious liberty though it allowed no public worship but the Calvinist and compelled all to

---

<sup>1</sup> *Permoli v. The First Municipality*, 3 Howard, 609.



support it; when he hears Rhode Island claimed as the first colony to acknowledge the rights of conscience and give full freedom to religion, though, in fact, it excluded Catholics from that boon as distinctly as Georgia did,—when a Catholic hears this, he will look up at the speaker and try philosophically to form some idea of the mental process by which men, who have sufficient intelligence to read and write and an amount of honesty sufficient to keep them out of State prison, can continue to repeat absurdities which a very slight amount of examination or reflection ought to make them blush even to have uttered or countenanced.

It is a very difficult thing to understand such men and such minds, and yet, parrot-like, men go on repeating the same old song. *Mentita est iniquitas sibi* is a curious statement, if we analyze it, and this word of truth may clear the matter up. Iniquity is, inherently, simply unfairness, a want of equity, of justice. And here we see this prevailing traditional want of fairness, where Catholics are concerned, not only perverting the truth, but perverting the mind so as to accept error for truth, lying not to others but to itself.

In the last century, during the colonial days, Congregationalism was established by law in most of New England, the Church of England in Virginia, New York, and some other colonies, while others—and all, to some extent—maintained the supremacy of the “Protestant religion.” Notwithstanding the great change wrought by the Revolution, and the establishment of the present Federal government, this virtual establishment of the Protestant religion exists, to some extent, under the mask of religious liberty. “The Bible,” says Chillingworth, “is the religion of Protestants,” using the word Bible to mean King James’s English translation. The same Bible, we are constantly told, is the only rule of Protestant faith. We have public schools in all parts, and this book, which is the religion of Protestants, their professed rule of faith, is forced into the schools, and men stultify themselves by asserting that these schools are non-sectarian, as though their being Protestant did not necessarily constitute their being distinctly sectarian and a violation of religious freedom. A recent Russian work on this country notes the self-deceit and fraud of this course, and states that the public school system of the United States, while pretending and professing to be non sectarian and without religious bias, is really Protestant. It is consequently proselytizing, and the States year by year raise and expend millions of dollars which are employed to weaken the faith of young Catholics and imbue them with Protestant ideas. Under Mr. Blaine’s amendment the Supreme Court of the United States, whose decisions alone are law, would undoubtedly be compelled to declare our present school system un-



constitutional, as a gross violation of liberty of conscience. So long as each State has power to establish a religion, in whole or in part, it may make Protestantism the official religion, and enforce its doctrines, worship, and forms in the State schools, State poor-houses, State prisons, State asylums; but once an amendment to the Constitution of the United States takes this power from the several States, this enforcement of the Protestant religion in any State will be a violation of the Federal Constitution.

The minds of our fellow-citizens are so warped and biassed on this point, in regard to the schools, that we Catholics prefer to suffer wrong, to be taxed for schools which are as Protestant as any Protestant church, to which we cannot in conscience send our children, and then to erect, endow, and maintain schools where our offspring may be educated without losing but preserving their faith.

In regard to the penal and eleemosynary institutions in each State the case is different. Penal institutions must ever belong to the State, and many eleemosynary institutions, especially those of a reformatory character, must continue to be State institutions, although the Catholic body has no fewer than 374 asylums and hospitals in the country, models of correct and economical management, and fruitful in the best results.

The question arises as to the religious status of Catholics in the penal and eleemosynary institutions under State control. When a person is committed to jail, penitentiary, or State prison, it is never made part of the sentence that he shall, during the time for which he is sentenced, be cut off from attending the worship of the church to which he belongs, nor is a part of his sentence that he shall be compelled to take part in any form of worship which is repugnant to him. It is not part of his punishment; the law does not make it so; the court does not pronounce it. If he is cut off, it is not as part of the punishment awarded to him. Yet if this is done, and not done as part of his punishment, it is hard to conceive under what pretext it is done. It is not a necessary sequel of his sentence.

The right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, the right not to be forced to join in a worship which he believes to be unacceptable to God, is a right which the convict possesses, and of which no man has a right to deprive him.

Still stronger is the case of reformatories, where moral reformation rather than punishment is the aim. To do violence to the religious convictions implanted into a person from the cradle, to force such a person to take part in religious exercises which a person's faith forbids, may produce hypocrites and canting scoundrels, but cannot send out such persons morally reformed or better than

when they entered. When, as has frequently happened, this compulsory attendance on religious services is enforced by coarse and brutal severity, we cannot wonder at the poverty of results shown by such institutions as the House of Refuge or the Elmira Reformatory.

The third class of institutions, is created in behalf of those whose poverty appeals for shelter, who are simply unfortunate, not criminal, who have done nothing to forfeit any right. There can be no pretext whatever for any wanton prohibition by which they are cut off from the opportunity of attending the worship of their own church, or for any rule by which they are forced to join in a worship which they in their own hearts condemn.

Catholics, in most States, have for years had reason to complain that in all these institutions their erring or unfortunate fellow-believers have wantonly been deprived of a right which Americans boast exists in every part of the country, and of which our Protestant fellow-citizens would never submit to be deprived.

"The Protestant religion," using the term in the sense in which it is understood in many old statutes, is established almost universally in the penal and eleemosynary institutions. A Catholic inmate cannot attend the worship of his church or practice its ordinances, inasmuch as a Catholic priest is not allowed to say Mass for the Catholics or communicate with them. On the contrary, there is a Protestant chaplain who holds Protestant service which Catholics are compelled to attend.

To put the facts in blunt, plain language would excite general reproach, and, accordingly, the plan is carried out with marvellous bad faith and hypocrisy. One of the favorite explanations for this system of religious tyranny and oppression is that it would interfere with the discipline of an institution to have many persons coming to officiate for the prisoners or inmates. Where human rights and human freedom are concerned Americans ought not to deem the discipline of a prison or poor-house paramount. But the pretext is one made absolutely in bad faith. The time required for the celebration of Mass, allowing a period previously for hearing the confessions of any who wish to comply with the ordinance of confession, need not exceed an hour, and could precede or follow the Protestant service. The priest would be one appointed by the bishop of the diocese, and it would be his duty to present his authorization to the authorities of the institution.

Another hypocritical pretext is that the chaplain makes non-sectarian discourses, and that Catholics ought not to complain; but as the Protestant chaplain takes his Protestant Bible and utters Protestant doctrine, he and his Bible and his doctrine are utterly sectarian, and intensely sectarian, so far as a Catholic is concerned.



Governor Cornell of New York, on vetoing "An act to secure to inmates of institutions for the care of the poor, freedom of worship, and to provide for the visitation of such institutions for that purpose," saw this insurmountable difficulty, and it taxed all the ingenuity of his bigotry to give a reason. He lays down a new principle utterly unheard of in any land, at variance with Christianity and the whole teaching of its Founder, a principle that Herod and Pilate would have adopted to crush Christianity in the bud. "To be able to enjoy freedom of worship, however," says this official, "presupposes certain conditions, important among which is the ability of independent or self-maintenance."

"Therefore," he concludes, "they should not be subject to the rivalries of sectarian zealots," and he does this as serenely as though his veto did not consign Catholics, Jews, and all non-Protestants to this very "subjection to sectarian zealots," for so long as they are forced to take part in a religious worship devised by a state or a jailer, they are at the mercy of sectarian zealots, and little as he imagined it, Governor Cornell in his act showed himself a sectarian zealot.

He might learn a lesson in equity and justice from the action of the Western House of Refuge, which resolved: "That the prayer of the petition of parents and guardians of Catholic children in the Western House of Refuge, for freedom of religious profession and worship, be and is hereby granted, in such manner and under such rules and regulations as can be made convenient and consistent with the rules and regulations of the institution."

The position of Catholics in various parts of this country, under existing laws and systems, will give some idea of the extent to which their religious rights are trampled upon by men who claim to be the most liberal and tolerant of mankind, and by the thousands of others who blindly take up a popular cry without ever stopping to think and reflect for themselves.

We are fond of boasting of the superiority of America in point of liberality to all other countries, and we consider England as far behind us in this regard. We are welcoming the persecuted Jews from Russia with no little self-laudation of our great moral grandeur and utter freedom from any spirit of persecution, yet if the Russian Jew becomes an inmate of a State institution he will find that he will be compelled to attend Protestant worship, and be punished as contumacious if he resists.

During the time when the penal laws against Catholics were in full vigor in England, and the prisons were crowded with recusants,—that is, Catholics who refused to take an oath condemning their own religion,—the authorities delighted in forcing the Catholic prisoners to the prison chapels where a Protestant officiated.

The Catholics never yielded, but by shuffling, praying aloud, and otherwise defeated the tyrannical object, although it resulted in much hardship and privation to themselves.

We do now what the English did then. Lest any one ask whether the English government is any better now, we give the following extracts from acts on the statute-books of Great Britain:

*"From the Act 31 and 32 Vict., cap. 122 (July 31st, 1868), entitled 'An Act to make further Amendments in the Laws for the Relief of the Poor in England and Wales.'*

"SECTION 16. *A Separate Creed Register to be Kept in Every Workhouse and Pauper School.*—The officer for the time being acting as the master of a workhouse, or as the master or superintendent of a district or other pauper school, shall keep a register of the religious creed of the pauper inmates of such workhouse or school separate from all other registers, in such form and with such particulars as shall be prescribed by the Poor-law Board by an order under their seal, and shall, as regards every inmate of such workhouse or school at the date to be fixed by such order, and subsequently upon the admission of every inmate therein, make due inquiry into the religious creed of such inmate, and enter such religious creed in such register.

"SEC. 17. *How the Religion of Children is to be Entered in the Creed Register.*—In regard to any child in the workhouse or school under the age of twelve years, whether either of its parents be in the workhouse or not, or whether it be an orphan or deserted child, the master or superintendent shall enter in such register, as the religious creed of such child, the religious creed of the father, if the master or superintendent know or can ascertain the same by reasonable inquiry; or, if the same cannot be so ascertained, the creed of the mother of such child, if the same be known to the said master or superintendent, or can be by him in like manner ascertained; and the creed of an illegitimate child under the said age shall be deemed to be that of its mother when that can be ascertained.

"SEC. 19. *Creed Register to be Open to Inspection of Minister.*—Every minister of any denomination officiating in the church, chapel, or other registered place of religious worship of such denomination which shall be nearest to any workhouse or school, or any ratepayer of any parish in the Union, shall be allowed to inspect the register which contains the entry of the religious creed of the inmates at any time of any day, except Sunday, between the hours of ten before noon and four after noon.

"SEC. 20. *The Minister may, subject to Regulations, Visit and Instruct Inmates Registered as of his Religious Creed.*—Such minister may, in accordance with such regulations as the said board shall approve, or by their order prescribe, visit and instruct any inmate of such workhouse or school entered in such register as belonging to the same religious creed as such minister belongs to, unless such inmate, being above the age of fourteen, and after having been visited at least once by such minister, shall object to be instructed by him.

"SEC. 21. *Where no Religious Service is Provided in the Workhouse, the Inmate may, subject to Regulations, go to his own Proper Place of Worship.*—Every inmate for whom a religious service according to his own creed shall not be provided in the workhouse shall be permitted, subject to regulations to be approved of or ordered by the Poor-law Board, to attend, at such times as the said board shall allow, some place of worship of his own denomination within a convenient distance of the said workhouse, if there be such in the opinion of the board: *Provided*, That the guardians may, for abuse of such permission previously granted, or on some other special ground, refuse permission to any particular inmate, and shall in such case cause an entry of such refusal and the grounds thereof to be made in their minutes.

"SEC. 22. *No Child in the Workhouse or School Visited by a Minister of its own Religion shall be Required to Attend any other Religious Service, unless, being above*



*Twelve Years of Age, he shall desire to do so, and shall be Considered by the Poor-law Board Competent to Judge in the Matter.*—No child, being an inmate of a workhouse or such school as aforesaid, who shall be regularly visited by a minister of his own religious creed for the purpose of religious instruction, shall, if the parents or surviving parent of such child, or in the case of orphans or deserted children, if such minister make request in writing to that effect, be instructed in any other religious creed, or be required or permitted to attend the service of any other religious creed, than that entered in such register as aforesaid, except any child above the age of twelve years who shall desire to receive instruction in some other creed, or to attend the service of any other religious creed, and who shall be considered by the Poor-law Board to be competent to exercise a judgment upon the subject.”

No similar legislation protecting the rights of conscience exists in any part of the United States. Nearly forty years ago a law to protect the religious rights of inmates of State institutions was introduced into the New York legislature, but failed to pass, and we have seen that Governor Cornell, in 1881, vetoed a law that did pass. What was said a few years ago still applies.

“We have likewise to complain,” says the *Catholic Union* of New York, “of the partiality which prevails in the administration of the State prisons, and in almost all the penitentiaries and reformatories. Not a Catholic priest has ever been appointed chaplain to one of these State prisons, and although a large number of our coreligionists are unfortunately inmates of these institutions, from the time they enter to the hour they finally quit their cells, they are dependent on the pleasure or caprice of the superintendent or officer in charge for the privilege of enjoying the spiritual consolations of their religion; nay more, such convicts are obliged to attend worship where doctrines are taught which they do not and cannot believe.”

Ohio has the credit of having been one of the first to put on her statute-book a law which would prevent keepers of prisons, matrons of poorhouses, and superintendents of asylums from forcing the poor creatures under their brutal control to attend such religious services as they fancied, or preventing access to the clergymen of their faith. In 1874–1875 was passed the following act:

*“An Act to Secure Liberty of Conscience in Matters of Religion to Persons Imprisoned or Detained by Authority of Law.*

“SECTION 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That, as liberty of conscience is not forfeited by reason of conviction of crime or by reason of detention in any penal, reformatory, or eleemosynary institution, or any house of refuge, workhouse, jail, or public asylum in this State, no person in any such institution shall be compelled to attend religious worship or instruction of a form which is against the dictates of his or her conscience; and it shall be the duty of every director, trustee, superintendent, or other person having in charge any such institution to furnish ample and equal facilities to all such persons for receiving the ministrations of the authorized clergymen of their own religious denominations or persuasions, under such reasonable rules and regulations as the trustees, directors, managers, or superintendents*

shall make; but no such rules shall be so construed as to prevent the clergyman of any denomination from fully administering the rites of his denomination to such inmates; *provided*, such ministration entail no expense on the public treasury."

There is nothing in this that is not in perfect harmony with American institutions and a natural sequel to the religious freedom it is our claim to have established, unless that freedom is a mere delusion and a sham. Yet it is melancholy to be compelled to state that the people of Ohio are so far removed from any real spirit of liberty that this act aroused the most bitter and vindictive feeling throughout the State. It was regarded as a direct blow at the Protestant ascendancy, and the voters of the State demanded its repeal. The Protestant Church in Ohio could not exist—it was not safe—unless its doctrines and worship were forced on the Catholics and other inmates of the penal and eleemosynary institutions. The law was doomed. The next year—the centennial year of American independence—saw it repealed (January 21st, 1876) and blotted from the statute-book. Ohio put distinctly on record the glaring and terrible fact that she absolutely rejected the principles of religious liberty and, like New England of old, proclaimed toleration "an evil egg." Henceforward the Catholic in that State is left to the tender mercies of any bigot in power in prison or poorhouse, who can feel assured that his brutality and tyranny have the sanction and moral support of the highest citizens of the State. Now, as of yore, in the Commonwealth of Ohio, the Catholic priest—who offers his labor gratuitously to instruct and reform Catholic prisoners, while Protestant clergymen are drawing salaries for trying to pervert and demoralize them—is told, as he has been defiantly told for years, that he cannot and must not enter.

Kentucky has just passed a law similar to that adopted in Ohio and then so basely and so ignominiously repealed. The chivalric State of Henry Clay promises better things, and we cannot fear that it will ever degrade itself by repealing a law founded on natural justice and the inherent right of every one to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience.

This act is as follows :

"SECTION I. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky*, That all persons committed to any State prison, reform school, house of refuge, or other place of confinement in said State, shall be allowed spiritual advice and spiritual ministration from any recognized clergyman of the denomination or church to which such persons so committed or received may respectively belong or have belonged prior to their being so committed or received into such prison, school, house of refuge, or other place of confinement. Such advice and ministration to be given within the prison, or reform school, or house of refuge, or other building where the inmates of same are required by law to be confined or imprisoned, in such manner as will secure to such persons the free exercise of their religious belief; and such religious



consolation, advice, and ministration shall be allowed separate and apart, and out of the presence and hearing of any person other than the clergyman who is ministering to such inmates and the officer in charge of same. Such clergyman shall have the right, at the time fixed, as hereinafter provided, and in all cases of serious sickness, for the benefit of those sick, without regard to time, to visit any of said institutions, and to see and communicate freely and untrammelled with such of said sick inmates as belong to the church or society of which he is a clergyman.

"SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the board of trustees, or persons or officers having control and management of said institutions to set apart not less than one hour on the first day of each week, in which any of the clergymen in good standing, of any church or denomination, may freely minister and impart moral and religious instruction to, and perform such religious service as the law of their respective churches may require for those of the said inmates who respectively belong to such church or society, or did belong thereto prior to their being committed or confined to such institutions, and to provide and furnish to such clergymen, on such occasions, a room or apartment whereby they may be enabled to freely and properly discharge their duties as such clergymen. *Provided*, That all such religious ministrations shall be given between the hours of eight o'clock in the forenoon and five o'clock in the afternoon, except in special cases, such as sickness, when such ministration may be given at any hour and on any day; and that the board of officers in charge of said institutions shall designate to each denomination the hours so designated, when a clergyman shall commence and impart such ministrations and instructions, and the time they shall occupy, giving to each denomination an equal amount of time, without partiality or any unjust discrimination whatever. *Provided*, That if, by the belief of such denomination, any other day of the week than the first day be regarded as the Sabbath, then such instruction and services may be held on such other day.

"SEC. 3. In all matters pertaining to religion, the rights of conscience and the free exercise thereof shall be scrupulously respected and guarded. *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to prohibit or limit such freedom of speech among the employes or inmates of said institutions as is permitted by the rules and regulations thereof not in conflict with this act.

"SEC. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to authorize any additional expenditure on the part of the State or of any of said institutions.

"SEC. 5. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 6. A wilful violation of the provisions of this act shall be a misdemeanor, and shall be punished by a fine of not less than twenty-five dollars nor more than one hundred dollars.

"SEC. 7. The provisions of this act shall also apply to the Institute of St. Xavier, in the city of Louisville.

"SEC. 8. Nothing in this act shall be so construed as to prevent or prohibit the reading of the Bible or the moral instructions as now practiced in said institutions."

This is, we think, the most full, clear, and explicit law yet passed in any State to protect the religious liberty of inmates of State institutions. It was drawn with care, to meet all the difficulties, but in its practical working may encounter obstacles not foreseen.

The constitutions of many of the States, and the line of decisions under them, are broad enough in their terms to protect Catholics, but, unfortunately, when the rights of a Catholic are brought into the courts, constitution and law are alike forgotten, the ermine is trailed in the mire, and the judge yields to popular clamor and bigotry.

Nothing, one would imagine, could be more explicit and clear than the language of the Constitution of Pennsylvania: "That all

men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences<sup>1</sup>; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his consent." (Constitution of Pennsylvania, Art. ix, Sec. 3.) In construing this, the courts declare "that Christianity is part of the common law of Pennsylvania; not Christianity founded on any particular religious tenets, but Christianity with liberty of conscience to all men."<sup>1</sup>

Yet, in utter defiance of this, it is maintained that it is illegal to have the Catholic worship offered in a penal or eleemosynary institution by a Catholic clergyman for the Catholic inmates. It is never permitted. The Catholic who passes its portals finds the high-sounding promises of the Constitution of the State founded by the liberal and tolerant Penn to be

"Like Dead Sea fruit, that tempts the eye  
And turns to ashes on the lips."

While he is in the merciless clutches of the Pennsylvania law and its fanatically bigoted executors, he can never take part in the worship of God which his conscience calls for, and the ministrations of a Protestant of some shade are forced on him, for the State (Penitentiaries, x, 32) establishes in each prison a religious instructor (mark the sophistical ingenuity to avoid the word chaplain) "to attend to the moral and religious instruction of the convicts." In some parts (33) the inspectors may appoint a moral instructor "to advise and instruct the prisoners, and perform such other services as appertain to his station." If these moral and religious gentlemen confined their ministrations to Protestants who wished their services, and drew their pay, leaving Catholics to the unpaid ministrations of their own clergy, it might be endurable; but the same law (Sec. 24) declares that none but official visitors, designated in the law, shall have any communication with the convicts, and that no visitor shall supply them with any article of any kind. No priest, therefore, can have any communication with them, give an inmate a Catholic book, a pair of beads, a crucifix, or anything to revive his faith and lead him to contrition and an amendment of his life.

Yet, to be just, there is one Pennsylvania institution where the sun of justice must shine with greater force, and some faint idea of religious liberty seems to have dawned on the benighted minds of Pennsylvania legislators. A Catholic in the Western House of Refuge has no rights in health, but in sickness he enters at once into the possession of a liberty of conscience not recognized in any

<sup>1</sup> *Updegraph v. Commonwealth*, 11 S. & R., 394, 400; *Zeissweis v. James*, 63 Penn. Rep., 465.



of his faith in health. The distinction is a curious one, and seems to be a new and brilliant idea. Who ever heard of any country, state, or kingdom where a sick man was held to be able to buy or sell, make note or bond, execute a will or deed, marry, or lecture on women's rights, but where a man in sound health was disqualified to do any of these things? There is no trace anywhere else of sick persons having greater civil rights than the healthy, of any man gaining rights as he loses health, and incurring, with health, any civil disability.

"All persons," says this curious Pennsylvania enactment, "committed to the Western House of Refuge shall be allowed, in all cases of sickness, spiritual advice and spiritual ministration from any recognized clergyman of the denomination to which said inmate may belong, such advice and ministration to be obtained within sight of the person or persons having such inmates in charge; but if any person or persons seeking such desire the same out of the hearing of any officer of said institution, then, in that instance, they shall not be debarred by any rule of said house of refuge."

In other words, in every other Pennsylvania institution the dying Catholic may implore and appeal for the ministration of a priest to admit him to the ordinances of his church; the demon of inexorable bigotry prevents it in the name of religious liberty; the priest is excluded; the dying sinner must perish in agony,

"Unshrived, unhouselled, unannealed."

Only in this favored spot is the Catholic secure in the rights that are inalienable,—rights for which our ancestors rose and battled a century ago. If this provision of law is founded on reason, is conformable to the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania, to natural justice, and sound reason, it should be extended to every institution in the Commonwealth, and to every inmate, whether in health or sickness. No court, surely, will declare the act unconstitutional or at variance with justice or natural rights. It upholds them and enforces them.<sup>1</sup>

Pennsylvania is not the only State which has put on its statute-book an act just as far as it goes, but by implication arraigning its general legislation for bigotry and intolerance. Massachusetts (General Laws, p. 863) provides: "Prisoners in the State prison, or in any jail, house of correction, almshouse, or other place of

---

<sup>1</sup> The case of Henry Ackley, a Catholic boy, who died May 29th, 1879, of cruel treatment in the Philadelphia House of Refuge, shows that in other institutions the same just law should obtain. Indeed, the terrible records of the Blockley Almshouse and one at least of the prisons show that the institutions of the State are conducted with gross inhumanity.

confinement, may, in their illness, on request to the warden, or keeper, or master, receive the visits of any clergyman\* they may desire."

This is not as broad or as explicit as the Pennsylvania act, and confined the right to the reception of a visit. When a priest, in an almshouse in that State, wished to hear the confession of a dying woman, the wife of the keeper refused to leave the apartment. The clergyman put her out of the room, attended to the dying member of his flock, and was sued for damages. The Supreme Court of Massachusetts (May 8th, 1878) decided against the clergyman. They regarded the wife of the keeper as a State officer, empowered to prevent a Catholic priest from carrying out an ordinance of his church, and condemned the priest for interfering with the keeper's wife in the discharge of what men of common sense will call her bigoted interference with the wishes of a dying woman, and her little better than devilish wish to prevent her from obtaining from the ministry of her clergyman the religious consolation which she desired; but the Solons of the Massachusetts bench regarded her as embodying the awful majesty of the Bay State, and performing a praiseworthy act.

A similar case occurred at Louisville, Kentucky, in January, 1880.

Yet in Massachusetts there was on the statute-book this law :

"An act to provide for religious instruction in prisons. 'Be it enacted, etc.,' as follows :

"SECTION 1. No inmate of any prison, jail, or house of correction in this Commonwealth, shall be denied the free exercise of his religious belief and liberty of worshipping God according to the dictates of his conscience, within the place where such inmate may be kept or confined; and it shall be the duty of the officers and boards of officers having the management and direction of any such institutions to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the intent and provisions of this act.

"SEC. 2. Nothing herein contained shall be so construed as to impair the discipline of any prison so far as may be needful for the good government and safe custody of its inmates.

"SEC. 3. This act shall take effect upon its passage.

["APPROVED, April 15th, 1875."]

This dying penitent was denied the liberty and free exercise of private confession, imposed by her religious belief, and the intruder who insisted on hearing what she said under the seal of confession was held up by this judge to be acting within the legitimate sphere of duties imposed by the State, not on her, but on her husband. Probably his honor would hold that his own wife in his absence could grant an order of arrest or try a case.

New Jersey is a State where inmates of public institutions are deprived of freedom of worship and of their religious liberties. It



is done with the full knowledge of the legislature, which has refused to remedy the evil. The State reformatory is closed to the Catholic clergyman, and the State refuses to charter a Catholic reformatory, or confide the erring young of that faith to those who can make religion a means of their reformation. The superintendent of the reform school is to use his endeavors for the formation of religious habits, with such subordinate officers as the trustees may appoint. The State prison has a moral instructor, but the keeper is required "on Sunday to admit to the hall of the prison a sufficient number of pious, intelligent persons, competent to give instruction to the prisoners in the doctrines of the Christian religion." This does not, however, cover the ground, and under it a Catholic clergyman could not claim the right to say Mass for the Catholic inmates. It merely provides for instructions, but does not entitle the prisoners to have the public worship of God according to the dictates of their conscience; and instructing the people and offering worship to God are two very distinct and different acts.

It is needless to gather further extracts from the multitudinous volumes of laws of our many States and Territories. From what we have cited, the reader will see that in the general decline of respect and regard for individual rights, which is one of the most dangerous signs of our time, no rights are more trampled on or disregarded than those about which Americans generally pride themselves that their country is far beyond all other nations of the earth, and that is, the right to worship God according to the dictates of the individual conscience, according to the rites and ordinances of the ecclesiastical body to which he may belong, and the right to be shielded by the strong arm of the State from any tyrannical endeavor to force him to bend his knee to Baal by compulsory attendance at any form of worship, which, however satisfactory to others, is repugnant to him.

There is scarcely a State in the Union where these rights are not wantonly disregarded. Provisions in State constitutions are ignored, laws passed from time to time have been often crude, and in almost every case too vague and general in their terms, so that keepers and superintendents assume a right to enact laws, and as they have the power, they enforce them with unswerving fidelity to their own false judgment. Judges, too, who listen to fanaticism and prejudice, rather than right and justice, easily find means to evade them, and make new laws for a case instead of carrying out the constitutional laws of the State.

The English act has been tested for years, and has been found to be practical, easy, and free from objection, giving rise to no difficulty or derangement of discipline. Where friends of civil

and religious liberty seek in their respective States to introduce legislation to remedy existing evils, it would, perhaps, be better to adopt the English statute, as one already tested, and well defined by repeated decisions of tribunals whose legal ability will have weight everywhere.

The rights claimed by Catholics are: 1. To be free from compulsory attendance at Protestant worship of any shape or kind, and to be allowed on Sundays to have the Mass, the distinctive act of divine worship, offered for them so that they can attend. 2. To be allowed before Mass and in sickness to go to confession to a priest, without interference from any one, but with full respect for the privacy required by the rules of the Church. 3. To have a priest in sickness to administer the last sacraments.

So long as these rights are denied; Catholics must make constant efforts to secure them. To be deprived of these, is the hardest trial that can be imposed on a Catholic, and one that he feels most keenly. The Catholic may be remiss in his duties, fall under temptation, but whenever a good impulse arises in his heart he yearns for the means his Church affords him for amending his life. When he finds that instead of allowing him to profit by these means, the hireling officials, often ignorant and cruel men, try by brutality and punishment to force him to join in other worship, his worst passions are aroused, the feeling that might have led to permanent amendment is crushed, and the poor creature seeks only revenge. The New York House of Refuge gives an example of this, where the Catholic boys, provoked to rebellion by the cruel and arbitrary intolerance of those in power, resorted to violence, but the only result was that it sent them to the State prison, although the keepers were certainly not guiltless, either in the eyes of God or man.

A strenuous effort is always made by men whose bigotry blinds their judgment to prevent Catholics from enjoying their religious rights. One superintendent took the ground that the reformatories were for bad boys, not for church members or saints. Here he started from Protestant ground, and wished to carry his idea of church membership into the Catholic Church, where it never belonged. According to him, if a boy was sorry for his past life and really desirous of amendment, he ought not to be allowed to go to confession and seek the grace of God to keep his good resolutions. He insisted that the boy in such a case ought to be discharged, as he was no longer a fit subject for the reformatory. So little did this man, who boasted of twenty years' experience, know of the weakness of the best of human resolutions.

He insisted that he ought to be the only religious teacher for boys of all creeds, apparently unconscious that as a Protestant his



instructions must necessarily be sectarian to all who are not Protestants, for he laid it down with all gravity that all sectarian teachings should be carefully avoided and excluded from all charitable and penal institutions—which would have excluded his own when addressed to any but Protestants who accepted them; but in all his arguments he never recognized the inherent right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, without compulsion from any power.

"It seems almost incredible," says the *Catholic Young Men's National Union*, in 1881, "that a government so just and fair as ours, should allow such a state of affairs to exist, and we feel confident that if the matter is properly presented to the liberty-loving people of America, they will see that justice is done to all."

The discrepancies between the action of various States, and the general neglect of the States to frame clear and precise laws to protect the inhabitants in the enjoyment of their civil and religious rights, causes regret that the amendment of the Constitution of the United States, which was called for by the State of New Hampshire,—not by any movement of the Catholics as some have stated,—had not gone further, and not only prohibited Congress from impairing the religious liberty of the individual, but also declared that no State should by legal enactment, or, in fact, prevent any one from enjoying the right to worship God, or force him to take part in an alien worship.

The amendment introduced by Mr. Blaine aimed in this direction, but it was very crude and confused, and left room for equivocation and doubt. It prohibited the inculcating the doctrines of a sect, but was silent at the same time in regard to a class of sects. He was not certainly so shallow a man as to hold that the forcing of the tenets held by four or five sects in common on persons who did not accept them was a whit less sectarian than the forcing of the doctrines of any one sect on them. The evil to be checked is the forcing in prison, poor-house, or poor-school, public school if you will, the doctrines or theories or forms of worship of any one or thousand sects on any man or woman, boy or girl, whom God has made free, whom Christ has made free, and whom every American of every shade of religious and political thought ought to desire to see free to worship God.

The Blaine amendment could be easily recast so as to secure complete religious liberty to all men throughout the whole republic. It would be of incalculable service by neutralizing the miserable proselytizing spirit, which, in the general apathy of the masses of the people, allows a few fanatics to make every public institution, prison, penal institution, asylum, poorhouse, and other eleemosynary work, a vehicle for their petty systems of forcing

one set of religious ideas on persons who dislike and oppose them, and who, when checked in their nefarious trade, appeal by violent invective to the unthinking, and arouse a storm of religious hatred, under the influence of which they secure a new lease of power to make the State a tool in their proselytizing schemes.

Unless such an amendment is passed there must be constantly recurring excitements, unhealthy and demoralizing, injurious to the country, and fostering angry feelings between different classes in the community. So long as a class feel that they are wronged, they will seek redress. Sound policy, true wisdom, dictate that the wrong should be redressed promptly, and in this case that can be most completely and fully accomplished only by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

---

### MODERN SPIRITISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY.

*On Miracles and Modern Spiritualism.* Three Essays, by Alfred Russel Wallace. James Burns, 15 Southampton Row. London. 1875.

*Der Spiritismus und das Christenthum.* Dr. J. Wieser, S. J. Zeitschrift fuer Katholische Theologie. Innsbruck, Felician Rauch. 1880 and 1881.

A NEW and formidable enemy is lifting its head with a bold front against, not only Catholicity, but Christianity itself, and that enemy is Modern Spiritism.<sup>1</sup> It is not new in its nature and existence. Spiritism, which is nothing else than a systematic communication with certain spirits that claim to be departed souls, is very old. In ancient times it flourished under the name of *necromancy* among all gentile nations, and its abettors were condemned and punished by the law of Moses. Gœrres, Kreutzer, and Mirville, have shown that the practice of this the worst form of magic has continued unabated among idolatrous peoples down to our own day, and that there has not been an age in which it did not create disturbances here or there within the pale of Christianity.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Spiritualism*, according to the etymology of the word, is a generic term, applicable to everything spiritual; *Spiritism*, on the contrary, is a specific denomination proper only to spiritology. Hence, Spiritism is the correct *term* for the subject under consideration.



Externally, the novelty of Modern Spiritism lies in the manner in which it asserts itself among Christians, in its publicity, its rapid and immense diffusion, its brilliant triumphs, and its extraordinary pretensions and promises. Internally, it is new above all in the manifestation and exertion of an unprecedented intrinsic strength. The specific difference that distinguishes Modern Spiritism from all its forerunners, is its organization into a religion based on revelation and miracles,<sup>1</sup> and this is what makes it not only a new, but also a formidable enemy of Christianity. Modern Spiritism is not built, like the effete sects, upon negation; it is positive in word and work. It opposes Christian revelation and miracles with its own new revelation and marvels. By means of its marvels it can sate the sensational appetite of the empty-hearted irreligious multitudes; by its revelations it offers to solve every doubt, remove every anxiety, and abolish every difference of opinion, on the subject of religion; by the united influence of both it pledges itself to unite all nations in universal social and religious peace and concord, and within another century's time to usher in the millennium or golden age of the human race; and in all this it lays claim to a sublime providential mission, to wit, to give to the world the complement and ultimate perfection of Christianity, by at length interpreting and explaining it to the satisfaction of the minds and hearts of all men.

It is, therefore, of paramount importance to a Christian to study with great care the strength and weakness of this dangerous adversary, to have a clear view of the history of the rise, progress, triumphs, marvels, revelation, claims, and promises of Spiritism, to ascertain the value of its revelation, claims, and promises, and most of all to examine and judge its claims to the throne, sceptre and crown of Christianity.

Modern Spiritism was born in our midst; in its origin and progress it was at first exclusively American. There are those who remember how the revelations of the Fox family at Hydesville, New York, in 1848, sent the news of its discovery as if by telegraph through the land. The story of the haunting spirit of an unknown murdered man was nothing new in itself; every family had its traditional store of such winter-night tales. Moreover, the many similar events on record in well-authenticated history, as for instance Gœrres' account of the "rapping spirit" at Tedworth, in the reign of Charles II., should have been calculated, it

---

<sup>1</sup> This specific difference furnishes the best definition of the Spiritism that is called modern. Dr. Wieser's definition (*loc. cit.*, p. 662), "methodical experimenting in order to obtain certain strange phenomena, and by their means putting oneself in communication with their causes, to wit, the souls of the departed," evidently applies to Spiritism or necromancy in general.

would seem, to make the murdered beggar of Hydesville the family-talk of an evening, to be forgotten the next day. But this was not an ordinary ghost-story; the low rapping of the beggar's spirit inaugurated a greater drama than the eternal monotone of the buried majesty of the King of Denmark, on the drawbridge of the castle at Elsinore. That apparition at Hydesville was not made for the special benefit of the Fox family; it was meant for the world. For it must not be forgotten that the troublesome spirits, annoying, however, only because they created hard talk among Christian neighbors, would not depart from the haunted family but on condition that the girls should challenge a public examination. For the Christian mind that condition possesses a deep significance, as it is only another proof that the powers of darkness are not let loose on so vast a scale, unless men freely lend themselves to their designs and machinations. The Fox family accepted the condition, and the result was the examination of the celebrated "Rochester rappings," which gave Spiritism to the country. The sequel is the history of its triumphs. The movement rolled like a great wave from the Atlantic to the Pacific shore; in two years, Spiritism spread through the length and breadth of the land.

Foreign writers of distinction, especially Englishmen, were happy to announce to the European world, that the unprecedented spread of the Spiritist movement among us was owing to certain inherent defects,—and who does not know them?—of our national character; but when the fearless French, the unyielding German, and even the lofty English character, began to bend under the strange power, and presently caught up the American mania with enthusiasm, it became apparent that some other than a mere national weakness favored the rise and progress of Spiritism. History was only repeating itself. The ancient Greeks and Romans, who are still looked upon as the highest types of that greatness of which the natural man is capable, were as much given to magic as the nations whom they called barbarians, and necromancy, which is the Spiritism of that ancient world, was at home among them as much as Spiritism is among us to-day. Among the Jews alone it could get no footing; abettors of necromancy were held guilty of sin, and were punished with death by the law of Moses. As was laid down in a previous article,<sup>1</sup> in the ancient world the Jews alone preserved the correct knowledge and appreciation of the spirit-world; the Gentiles more and more lost sight of both, the farther they fell away from the true God, and corrupted the tradition of his primitive revelation. The same law of degeneracy has ruled the realms of error into which the sects have wandered away from the Church

---

<sup>1</sup> *Vide* October No., 1881, on the Spirit-world.



in the new law. Here lies the secret of the success of Spiritism. National character has very little to do with it; before its influence men of all nations are alike. The mysterious and the marvellous wield, by a law of our nature, a fascination over our souls, so strong, so enticing, so almost irresistible, as to prove when unlawful one of the most potent and dangerous temptations even to the virtuous. Had there been no tradition, no doctrine, no law, no religious principle to check that inborn curiosity and appetite, there is not a man, woman, or child, but would to-day be initiated in the mysteries of modern necromancy. If so many have resisted the temptation, those barriers must have stood in the way of their natural impulse; if millions have actually yielded, they must have either not recognized them, or overleaped them in defiance. If Spiritism has not been able to gain entrance into the stronghold of Catholicity, as is the fact, the wall of religion must surround it; if it has actually entered the domain of the sects and triumphed, it is because their wall was broken down. In point of fact, the sects as such did not raise their voices in protest, did not as such condemn and anathematize the intruder, did not offer resistance, but remained throughout listless, indifferent, and inactive. True, good men from among them, to whom the Christian faith was still the greatest gift of heaven, strove by all the means in their power to oppose the magical practices spreading around them; true, American Congregationalists especially distinguished themselves in the struggle against the new enemy, but neither they nor any other denomination were able to hinder its ravages upon their own domain. And what wonder? Only one power under heaven could effectually break and cripple the power of this adversary, only the old Christian doctrine on the spirit-world could arm men against its attacks, and that saving truth was either not to be had among the sects, or had grown so weak as not to be able to hold its ground. Defeat was inevitable, and it was signal. The very champions of the denominations who stood foremost in the fight, the very pastors who undertook to defend their flocks, found their own armor of faith too weak, discovered greater evidence and stronger in Spiritism than in Christianity, and surrendered at discretion if they did not openly go over to the enemy. From this last ignoble step many were doubtless deterred by the dread of losing their pulpit and their salary; but the fact was not the less patent that Spiritism had nothing to fear from the ministers of the sects. In their despair many of their flocks went so far as to look for help outside the citadel of religion, and in 1854 the world beheld with amazement the humiliating and sorrowful spectacle of fifteen thousand American Christians signing a memorial, praying Congress to examine into the doings of Spiritism. As was to be

expected, Congress received the petition as a good joke, some members moving that the investigation be intrusted to three thousand clergymen, others to the Committee of Foreign Relations, until it was ordered to "lie on the table." Nothing could have betrayed more effectually the decrepitude and helplessness of the sects. The sad fact was that the people were not stronger, and why should they be, than their pastors. They had long been taught, from father to son, that the individual is the judge of religion, and consequently of God, and they had exercised that right until it brought them to the borders of Rationalism and Materialism. Why should they heed the unlawfulness of Spiritism? They recognized neither a God, nor a Church, nor a religion to forbid it; they would do as they pleased, simply because they would own no religious restraint. Millions had thus been reared to live and toil only for this earthly life, and the food of such souls must invariably be what is popularly called *sensation*. Sensation is not an American product; it is in its essence pagan, or animal, if you choose, for as the very etymology of the word indicates, it is based upon sensuous pleasure, and may be savage, half-civilized, or refined, will always be found ruling supreme where the fundamental dogmas of Christian faith are torn out of man's heart, and this wearisome earth is all that is left to fill up the vast, unbearable void. By the millions, therefore, who had lost Christian faith, Spiritism was welcomed as an immense, a soul-stirring, and above all an inexhaustible sensation. In a few years Spiritism claimed a following of ten millions in our country alone. There may be exaggeration in the number, but those who have followed the history of Spiritism know that its triumph over the sects was complete; the reason, be it remembered, was that they had not enough of Christianity left to offer effectual resistance.

It would be a great mistake to imagine that the great sensation influenced the masses of the ignorant and unreasoning only; learned men, not only individually, but frequently in bodies corporate for the purpose, at once made it their task to subject the new phenomena to the closest scrutiny. As early as 1850, in a séance held in the rooms of Dr. Griswold in Boston, we find William Cullen Bryant, George Bancroft, James Fenimore Cooper, N. P. Willis, Dr. Hawkes, John Bigelow, Dr. E. E. Marcy, and Richard B. Kimball<sup>1</sup> examining into the doings of the Misses Fox. The answers of the spirits, we are told, were only partly satisfactory, sometimes even false; but the correct answers given to Mr. Cooper concerning the sex, age, and time and manner of death of a near relative he was thinking of, sent the wise men to their homes with a feeling akin to a severe chill. Presently, Professor Mapes, and Hare,

---

<sup>1</sup> The account of this séance was published by Mr. Kimball.



who won the proud title of "the American Faraday," and many other men distinguished in all the higher walks of life, openly declared themselves adherents and defenders of Spiritism.

And now, with the double prestige of popularity and respectability, Spiritism advanced to attack and overthrow Materialism.

In 1851, Judge Edmonds and Mr. Partridge, of New York city, openly embraced, practiced, and defended Spiritism, and the latter gentleman became, without knowing it, one of its greatest champions. It will be remembered that he called a Spiritist conference at his own house, to deliberate upon the best ways and means of opposing Materialism. The result of the labors of the conference was given to the public in the shape of a circular, in which the American people were informed that "the Divine Author of the universe is a conscious spiritual being, that He revealed somewhat of the spiritual world in ages long since past, through the medium of the Jewish people, and that in our own day and through our own American people, manifestations are being made from the spiritual into the natural world, whereby the immortality and unbroken continuity of the personal existence of all men is being daily demonstrated."

This was defying the "gods" of Materialism. Though from the first it had been evident that Spiritism by its very nature threw down the gauntlet to Materialists, and from the first men had eagerly watched to see whether they would take it up, Materialists had thought fit simply to ignore the enemy. But here came the open challenge of the New York conference, peremptorily summoning them, as they were men, to a fair contest. Spiritism presented itself before the tribunal of Materialism and demanded a trial.

The lesser scientists and naturalists avoided the subject with a strong aversion, natural enough, if we bear in mind the fixity of their "everlasting doctrines," and their well-developed instinct of self-preservation. These weak men took refuge behind the terrible front of a certain great chief, who had happened to catch an ill-starred impostor at his jugglery, and with his customary elevation above the rest of mankind, had forthwith pronounced his anathema, now and forever, upon all Spiritism as American humbug. That theatrical *tour de force* is now remembered only to make the wonderful Tyndall ridiculous. The truly great scientists, great above all in that they were thoroughly honest, did not hesitate to look the new enemy squarely in the face. Holding the object and purpose of science to be the examination and explanation of all existing phenomena, they realized that Spiritism must perforce fall within the sphere of scientific investigation. The extraordinary phenomena must either be explained or explained away. A denial of their reality, merely because they happened to be uncomfortably

obtrusive and dangerously aggressive, could not be safely ventured in the face of a host of witnesses, so many, so various, so intelligent, and so unobjectionable, that it would have been foolhardy to attempt to give them the lie. The reality of the facts once for all unimpeachable, it devolved upon true science to point out their causes, and to declare the truth, if need be at the sacrifice of the whole Materialistic creed. In a word, as honest scientists they saw that it was a duty, and as Materialists they felt that it was a necessity, to institute a high inquisition and sit in judgment on the cause of Spiritism. The cause was tried, not only in our country but also in England, France, and Germany, and to their credit be it said, men never fulfilled a difficult duty more conscientiously, more scrupulously. The result of the thousand and one trials was startling. The force of evidence on the side of Spiritism was irresistible to minds open to conviction, and the greatest Materialists of the day became from judges its leading advocates. The grand inquisition of Materialists was in a few months turned into the propaganda of Spiritism, spreading it through the entire civilized world, through South America, through Europe, and through far Australia. Daniel Home took the lead in Scotland; William Crookes, the discoverer of thallium, and Alfred Russel Wallace, in England; Baron Gueldenstubbe, and Hippolyte Rivail (better known under the sobriquet of Allan Kardec), in France; States Attorney Aksakof (a Russian) and Professor Zoellner, in Germany; and Professor Butlerow, in St. Petersburg. England, especially, filled the first ranks with her illustrious men, such as Professors Morgan, Wharley, and Challis, William Carpenter, and Edward William Cox.

As among us, so also throughout Europe, numerous associations, technically called *circles*, were organized for the express purpose of giving the new phenomena a scientific investigation, always with the same result of conversion to Spiritism. The most noteworthy of these circles were, the "Scientific society for psychologic studies" in Paris, the "Berlin society for transcendental experimental physics," and the Spiritist society "Psyche" in Berlin, the "Society for Spiritist studies" in Leipzig, and the most famous of all, the special committee of the Dialectical Society of London.

Not the least interesting portions of Mr. Wallace's essays are those in which he gives an account of the desperate struggle of Materialists against the overwhelming evidence of their own experiments upon Spiritist phenomena. From among many examples in point to illustrate this death-struggle, it will be sufficient to select the committee of the Dialectical Society of London, and the great name of Alfred Russel Wallace.

In 1869 a paper on Spiritism, read by one of the members, ex-



cited the curiosity of the London Dialectical Society, a body of highly educated men, most of whom were Materialists and Free-thinkers. A committee of thirty-three members, made up of judges, physicians, professors, and high Church clergymen, was appointed "to examine and report upon the phenomena."

Of the thirty-three only eight believed at all in Spiritism; the rest were either skeptical or positively inimical. They divided into subcommittees of seven or eight to experiment in their own houses, so as to preclude all possibility of deception. For two years these men examined their own experiments with the most painstaking care, and in 1871 reported as a body in favor of Spiritism. Upon the refusal of the executive board of the society to give the report to the press, the committee published it on their own responsibility.

The experience of Alfred Russel Wallace is only a repetition of a thousand similar stories, but must be preferred as a piece of evidence, because of the high authority of the great naturalist, as well as the prominent role he has assumed among the champions of Spiritism. In his *Notes of Personal Evidence* (Essay ii., No. X.), he writes:

"During twelve years of tropical wanderings, occupied in the study of natural history, I heard occasionally of the strange phenomena said to be occurring in America and Europe under the general name of 'table-turning' and 'spirit-rapping;' and being aware, from my own knowledge of mesmerism, that there were mysteries connected with the human mind which *modern science ignored, because it could not explain*, I determined to seize the first opportunity on my return home to examine into these matters. It is true, perhaps, that I ought to state that for twenty-five years I had been an utter skeptic as to the existence of any preterhuman or superhuman intelligences, and that I never for a moment contemplated the possibility that the marvels related by Spiritualists could be literally true. If I have now changed my opinion, it is simply by the force of evidence. . . . I came to the inquiry utterly unbiassed by hopes or fears, because I knew that my belief could not affect the reality, and with an ingrained prejudice against even such a word as 'spirit,' which I have hardly yet overcome."

For eight years Mr. Wallace brought his keen powers of observation to bear upon the phenomena, assiduously repeating test-experiments in his own house, in the presence and with the assistance of none but his intimate and most trustworthy friends. At the end of that time he openly declared himself a believer, and became an advocate of Spiritism. His conversion was based entirely on his own personal experience. After describing his own experiments, he concludes:

"I have since witnessed a great variety of phenomena, some of

which are alluded to in other parts of this volume ; but I attach most importance to those which I have carefully and repeatedly tested, and which give me a solid basis of fact by which to judge of what others relate, or of what I have myself seen under less favorable circumstances."

At the same time he exposes the inability of materialistic science to explain the facts away. "Surely," he says of his own experiments, "these are phenomena about which there can be no mistake. What theories have ever been proposed by our scientific teachers which even attempt to account for them?"

This interrogatory of Mr. Wallace announces more loudly than the battle's trumpets the victory of Spiritism over Materialism. Materialism was defeated, and the consequences of that defeat were inevitable. Spiritism doubled and tripled its power from the very ranks of its conquered adversaries. In a very short time, as Mr. Howitt records, the number of its adherents ran up to twenty millions, of which he assigns ten to America alone. Dr. Wieser thinks the figures are exaggerated, and will hardly allow a census of more than a total of ten millions of Spiritists. Even that, we should think, were victory enough in so short a time. But Spiritism had gained a yet more formidable strength than that of numbers. A fair representation of the vigorous writers of materialism was now arrayed on its side. The result was a literature voluminous and, with all its defects, popular.<sup>1</sup> It is estimated that one hundred thousand Spiritist books and pamphlets have been sold every year in the States alone, and Dr. Wieser gives quite a list of the regular journals published in all Christian lands. Reports, memoirs, and professed histories, with all the recommendations of whatever is choicest in novelty of matter, have been lavished upon the reading world without intermission. Moreover, the countless test-experiments made by the whilom champions of Materialism had only served to draw out the hidden secrets of Spiritism, a huge mass of facts and spirit-communications, which it became the duty of those same champions, now converted, to compare, classify, and reduce to a system. In this manner a scientific *exposé* of the philosophy and theology of Spiritism has been given to the world, revealing its great forces marshalling for nothing less than a desperate struggle against Christianity itself.

The first division of its forces is made up of its marvels ; it opposes miracles to miracles.

---

<sup>1</sup> Turgid bombast and extreme sensationalism are the general characteristics of the Spiritist literature. There are exceptions, it is true, but even they are by no means free from the besetting sin of extravagance. Of all Spiritist writers Mr. Wallace is certainly by far the most moderate, and yet it will be seen that even he gives himself up to the wild imaginings of the Spiritist prophets.



Those extraordinary phenomena which created such a stir in the world, and were the means of gaining such signal victories over the sects and Materialism, are now so generally and well known as to need not so much a detailed description as an accurate and distinct classification. Viewed merely as facts, the minute divisions of Mr. Wallace are as scientific as could be desired;<sup>1</sup> but from a philosophical or theological standpoint they more naturally divide themselves into two large classes, the one *physical*, as rigorously postulating no higher agency than the ordinary forces of physical nature, the other *intellectual*, as necessarily involving the intervention of an intelligent cause.

The physical phenomena most common in the séances were at first of a uniform nature, such as the movement of furniture, the diminution of the specific gravity of bodies, the sounding and playing of musical instruments, notably of the violin, and the like, all effected by an invisible power. Later on came the sudden disappearance and re-appearance of the furniture of locked-up apartments, a feat which the spirits accounted for by their power to dissolve bodies into their atoms and recompound them. The same power over matter explained also the more startling *materialization*, as it is called, of spirit-forms, identical in appearance with those of deceased persons. These phantoms generally appeared only partially, luminous faces or silver-lit hands and arms brushing past the spectators, touching them, allowing themselves to be grasped, and then melting into the air. At times, and frequently enough to place the fact beyond suspicion, entire phantom forms were seen and tested. We believe it was Mr. Crookes who followed the famous phantom, called the "lady in flowing white," into an adjoining room, opened his dark lantern, and stood with the phantom beside the entranced medium, Miss Cooke.<sup>2</sup> According to Mr. Wallace these phantoms have been successfully photographed, and he gives a detailed description of two phantom pictures of his own mother, which appeared on his own photograph.<sup>3</sup> It would take too long to enumerate the other physical marvels, suffice it to say that they culminate in a veritable ordeal of fire, the mediums being thrust partially or wholly into the flames without receiving any injury.

For obvious reasons it is of paramount importance carefully to separate these merely physical phenomena from the intellectual.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vide Mr. Wallace's "Summary of the more important Manifestations, Physical and Mental."—*Essays*.

<sup>2</sup> Many will remember the experience of Mr. Livermore of New York,—the life-like apparition of his deceased wife through the agency of Miss Fox. Apparitions of entire spirit-forms are very rare.

<sup>3</sup> See Mr. Wallace's own account of this incident. It is well worth the attention of those who condemn the phantom-photos as a mean piece of trickery.

<sup>4</sup> Vide, October No., 1881, on the Spirit-world.

It is certain, whatever may be alleged to the contrary, that some of the former have been successfully produced by means of electricity and other physical forces, as appears from the notorious Recantation movement between 1858 and 1862. It would be bad logic, however, to conclude that they are always so produced: the hypothesis of spirit-agency must first be got rid of, a sheer impossibility, now that that agency has been demonstrated even in these effects.<sup>1</sup> It only follows that we cannot with safety argue to spirit-power without eliminating by a careful examination all possibility of deception.<sup>2</sup>

The case is quite different and the contrary in the intellectual phenomena, which by their very nature rest wholly and always on the actual intervention of an extraneous intelligence.

These intellectual manifestations were in the beginning effected by means of the rappings of the leg of a table, which were very soon superseded by the planchette, psychograph, and similar simple apparatus. Later on it was discovered that some mediums needed only to take hold of a pencil or pen, to be in a manner forced to write with feverish haste, nay, that without any action on the part of the mediums, and under the mere influence of their presence, there was formed a spontaneous writing, called by Spiritists "direct spirit-writing." More wonderful still, and far less explicable, are the "oral communications," made either through the mediums in a comatose state or trance, or by "direct spirit-speech" in the air. The spirits took possession of the mediums, made them discourse on arts and sciences of which they were ignorant, speak one unknown language after another,<sup>3</sup> announce events oc-

<sup>1</sup> After reviewing the examinations of the phenomena made by men of science in different countries, Mr. Wallace concludes: "It thus appears that in France, as well as in America and in this country, men of science of no mean rank have investigated these phenomena and have found them to be *realities*; while some of the most eminent hold the *spiritual theory* to be the only one that will explain them."

<sup>2</sup> It is beyond the purpose of the present review to examine the physical and intellectual phenomena in detail, especially with reference to their spiritual causes. The discussion of this subject may be said to be at an end, and the intervention of spirits from another world can no longer be disputed. If Dr. Wieser has devoted particular attention to the phenomena, it is because the novelty of Spiritism in Germany demanded an exhaustive treatment; he certainly did not fail in striking home once he had made away with the enemy's outposts. Spiritism has joined issue with Christianity upon the ground of revelation and miracles, and this issue is one of the great questions of the day.

<sup>3</sup> Judge Edmonds's daughter was wont to speak, when in a mediumistic state, Spanish, French, Greek, Italian, Portuguese, Latin, Hungarian, and Indian. The judge said of her: "She knows no language but her own, and a little smattering of boarding-school French, yet she has spoken in nine or ten different tongues, often for an hour at a time, with the ease and fluency of a native. It is not unfrequent that foreigners converse with their spirit-friends through her in their own language."—*Vide Wallace's Essays.*



cunning at the moment across the ocean, read aloud the hearts of the bystanders, diagnose correctly all kinds of diseases, and point out the most effectual course of treatment, prophesy coming events, and last, but not least, give a detailed account of the economy of the universe, the nature of the Spirit-world, and the destiny of man. At times the spirits would do all the talking themselves, but as a rule seemed to prefer to use the tongues of the mediums. The most remarkable feature in all these manifestations is their heterogeneous and conflicting nature. A little wisdom is given forth with a very flood of nonsense, as if the spirits would naturally prefer to play the clown, and only own their superior knowledge when challenged. They are exceedingly fond of such intellectual trifling as will amuse, astonish, or terrify their friends. The revelations concerning vital doctrines have been apparently coaxed from them by importunate questioning; but in reality they seem to be only too glad to propound their "revealed truths," after having worked up the doubting to a proper degree of curiosity and credulity. The result has been the *Spiritist Revelation* concerning the great truths that govern man's higher life.

It is not to be understood that this revelation is the work of the spirits alone. Spiritists themselves warn us, that whereas the spirits that communicate with us are mostly of the lower orders, mostly of an evil disposition, mischievous and wicked, and as prone to deceive us as our weakest brethren in the flesh, their communications must be carefully sifted, and out of all be gathered the pure grain of doctrine. This scrutiny is all the more necessary on account of the inveterate habit of the spirits to be so friendly as to sacrifice the truth to their desire of pleasing and humoring their votaries. However, since it happens that their clients do not disagree very much on the principal doctrines concerning the present and future life, the spirits have been able to come to a *tolerable* agreement in their endeavors to satisfy everybody, thus enabling the leaders of Spiritism to put together the Spiritist Revelation. The most distinguished evangelists of this new gospel are Dixon, Wallace, Kardec, and Zoellner, who are the acknowledged oracles of American, English, French, and German Spiritists.

Beginning with *Genesis*, we find this revelation dividing itself at the very start into the *Pantheistic* and *Deistic* views of the world, a suicidal division, it would seem, were it not a most amicable accommodation to the two great factions of unchristianized minds.

The father of the *Pantheistic* school of spirits is our own celebrated visionary, Andrew Jackson Davis, who is called the great forerunner of Spiritism. His doctrines, which he dictated in an unconscious state, were published in his book "*The Principles of Nature, her Divine Revelations, and a Voice to Mankind*" (1847),

and later on fully developed in his five volumes of "*The Great Harmony*." His view strongly reminds one of Neo-Schellingism, and is unmitigated Pantheism. According to this revelation there is only one being, which men call God; all other things are only emanations or evolutions of that single primal substance. The seven spheres of perfection through which spirits must ascend to consummated blessedness (which in his hypothesis is reabsorption into the absolute being of God), and the social Utopia of a golden age soon to come upon earth, are the other salient points of his revelation, which agree in the main with those of the *Deistic Revelation*, which will be fully explained below.

If not an open adversary, Dixon was certainly not a friend of Christianity. In his estimation Christ does not rank higher than the founders of the sects, rather stands lower, and is inferior even to the socialist fanatic, Charles Fourier, whose frenzies Davis fully indorses. Pantheistic Spiritism has hitherto had a comparatively small following, at least outside of Germany, where, for aught one might conjecture, the strong Spiritist movement recently inaugurated may turn wholly in its favor. Avowedly Pantheistic, there can be no concealment or palliation of the anti-Christian tendency of this school of Spiritists, and as such it has the anathemas of reason and of Christianity branded upon its forehead.

*Deistic Spiritism* is a far more wily and dangerous enemy of Christianity. According to Allan Kardec's masterly statement of its doctrines,<sup>1</sup> God *created* the spiritual and corporeal worlds, the former being, however, the original and normal. The spirits of that world range through seven spheres of higher and still higher perfection. The highest sphere, that of angels or pure<sup>2</sup> spirits, is distinguished for its proximity to the Godhead, for great wisdom, love of good, and purity of feeling. The other classes descend lower and lower in the scale of perfection, reaching down to the lowest depths of intellectual and moral depravity. All those spirits must, however, in the course of ages, ascend to higher spheres even unto the highest. This law of amelioration is carried out by means of *incarnation*; the spirits must become men, a lot which falls to some as a penance, to others as a mission. Thus we have the genesis of man; thus human existence is a trial through which

<sup>1</sup> Le livre des Esprits; Le livre des Médiums; L'Evangile selon le Spiritisme; Le Ciel et l'Infer; La Genèse, les miracles et prédictions, d'après le Spiritisme, are Allan Kardec's principal works. For a fuller analysis of his Revelation, see Father Wieser's Review.

<sup>2</sup> The angels of Spiritism are not pure spirits in the Catholic or strict philosophical sense of the word. Spiritists call them pure, not because they are by nature independent of matter, or cannot inform a body, for according to their doctrine all spirits, even the pure, can become incarnate. By *pure* they mean that moral and intellectual purity which the words immediately following describe.



spirits must repeatedly pass before they reach final perfection ; thus spirits, after leaving the body in death, are for a time wandering sprites, and then become incarnate again. It is asserted, though some spirit-voices are contradictory, that incarnation never takes place in the bodies of brute beasts. The union of the spirit with the human body is effected by means of the *perispirit*, that semi-material coil which is the ethereal body of the ghost after death. In fine, when the spirit has left the body, all recollections of former existences revive.

The account which spirits give of spiritland is little more than a fanciful sublimation of earth-life. There, as here, we shall have hills, plains, and rivers, gardens and vineyards, fruits and harvests, servants, business, and meals, and phosphorescent (but think of it) clothes. Nay, the lower spirits are so poorly off that they must use our modes of transfer when they do not choose to plod on foot. There is no such thing as judgment beyond the inevitable law of amelioration applied over and over again to the ascending spirit. There is no purgatory unless you choose to call human existence upon earth by that name. There are no devils in the old sense of the word, for all spirits must eventually reach the heights of consummated perfection and bliss. Therefore, there is no hell ; there can be no such thing.

But what about God ? The most knowing spirits, we are told, know no more about Him than we do ; He is even to them *the great unknown*. Ask them about the Trinity, the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, and they answer, we do not know. Ask them whether God is a person, and they say they know nothing about it.

And what about Christ ? The blasphemous goblins answer, He is not the Son of God, but one of the highest spirits, who, in his incarnate state, was so purified of the grossness of matter as to be his own medium in working wonders. His are the greatest of Spiritist miracles ; his declaration that He was the Son of God and Saviour of men, was a hallucination. His Church was a superb invention, the highest institution upon earth in the past, an imperfect beginning, however, of that grand providential amelioration of mankind, of which Spiritism, *Modern Spiritism*, is to be the complement and ultimate perfection. Spiritism alone explains the life and miracles of Christ aright, it alone enhances his moral teaching, alone satisfactorily accounts for the wondrous lives of his great followers, the saints, alone reveals the mysterious future of its Apocalypse, alone purifies, develops, and perfects time-honored Christianity, so that it will take captive every human heart, and uniting all men in one fold, inaugurate the millennium of the golden age upon earth. In one word, *Deistic Spiritism* is not the enemy of Christianity ; it is Christianity itself in its complete growth and final perfection.

Such is the brief *résumé* of Kardec's Deistic gospel of Spiritism. Professor Zoellner agrees with him throughout, as may be seen in Dr. Wieser's *Review*. Mr. Wallace's summary is succinct enough to be quoted *verbatim*. He thus formulates the *Moral Teachings of Spiritism*:

1. "Man is a duality, consisting of an organized spiritual form, evolved coincidently with and permeating the physical body, and having corresponding organs and developments.

2. "Death is the separation of this duality, and effects no change in the spirit, morally or intellectually.

3. "Progressive evolution of the intellectual and moral nature is the destiny of individuals, the knowledge, attainments, and experiences of earth-life forming the basis of spirit-life.

4. "Spirits can communicate through properly endowed mediums. They are attracted by those they love or sympathize with, and strive to warn, protect, and influence them for good, by mental impression when they cannot effect any more direct communication; but, as follows from clause 2, their communications will be *fallible*, and must be judged and tested just as we do those of our fellow-men."

After eloquently maintaining that Spiritism explains all miracles, he comes to its revelations concerning God and Christ. He writes:

"Nothing is more common than for religious people at séances to ask questions about God and Christ. In reply, they never get more than *opinions*, or *more frequently the statement that they, the spirits, have no more direct knowledge of those subjects than they had while on earth.*"

Mr. Wallace concludes his great *Defence of Modern Spiritualism*, with the following grand summing up:

"A science of human nature which is founded on observed facts; which appeals only to facts and experiment; which takes no beliefs on trust; which inculcates investigation and self-reliance as the first duties of intelligent beings; which teaches that happiness in a future life can be secured by cultivating and developing to the utmost the higher faculties of our intellectual and moral nature, and *by no other method*, is and must be the natural enemy of all superstition. Spiritism is an experimental science, and affords the only sure foundation for a true philosophy and a pure religion. It abolishes the terms "supernatural" and "miracle," by an extension of the sphere of law and the realm of nature; and in doing so it takes up and explains whatever is true in the superstitions and so-called miracles of all ages. It, and it alone, is able to harmonize conflicting creeds; and it must ultimately lead to concord among mankind in the matter of religion, which has for so many ages been the source of increasing discord and incalculable evil; and it will be able to do this, because it appeals to evidence instead of faith,



and substitutes facts for opinions, and is thus able to demonstrate the source of much of the teaching that men have so often held to be divine."

Such is Modern Spiritism ; such is in brief the history of its rise, progress, triumphs, marvels, revelations, claims, and promises. These broad outlines will, it is hoped, be sufficient to give an accurate idea of this new and formidable enemy of Christianity. Our next endeavor must be to ascertain the value of the Spiritist Revelation, claims, and promises.

---

## THE EXISTENCE OF GOD DEMONSTRATED.

ON WHAT GROUND DOES THE ATHEIST DENY THE EXISTENCE OF GOD ?

### FOURTH AND CONCLUDING ARTICLE.

THE human intellect never embraces error, unless it be clothed with the semblance of truth. This lies in the nature of reason itself. With its natural tendency to truth, it cannot adhere to a judgment which is not really or seemingly true. Hence no false opinion, whatever part the will may have in it, can spread among men, unless some reasons for its truth be held forth. Yet the more specious and glittering such reasons are, the sooner it will find its way to the human mind. Since, then, the semblance of truth lends a charm to error, it is not enough to advance solid proofs for a great and important tenet, but it is also necessary to lay open the absurdity of the reasons alleged for its denial, in order thus to undeceive the erring and warn those who are not yet misled against the showy appearance of a fatal falsehood.

Atheism, too, now so widely spread in human society, must have put on an appearance of truth ; and, indeed, it presents itself under a very deceitful garb. It is not contented with some objections against the usual proofs for the existence of God ; it rests on whole philosophical systems ; it is to be traced back to the first principles of science ; it grows from tenets which promise to overthrow all the old laws of thought, and to effect a restoration of all human knowl-

edge. Of course, we cannot discuss here the various theories that result in the denial of God's existence; we intend, however, to reduce them to some general points of view, as far as it is necessary to disclose their intrinsic contradictions, and thus to show the groundlessness and absurdity of the great fundamental heresy of our times.

First of all, critical or transcendental criticism is to be spoken of. Kant had admitted that as cause was an innate form of the understanding, so also the hypothetical syllogism, that is, the conclusion from effect to cause, was an inborn mode of theoretical reason. Hence it followed that as cause and dependence on it, in general, so also the ultimate cause, on which all things depend, had no reality in the objective order, but was, if conceived to be without us, a mere product of our own mind, just as the yellow color of the object seen by a sick person is the effect of the jaundice that affects the eyes. Of Kant's followers some adopted his views with all their consequences; others modified them, so, however, as, with regard to God, to arrive at the same conclusion. Thus, from modern philosophers we sometimes hear the following theory: To the human mind the tendency is inborn to reduce all things known to unity, not so that unity is necessarily discovered by the mind in the object, but so that on the object it is reflected by the mind. Now things are subordinate to one another by the relations of dependence and causality, and hence in this universe order is put by conceiving it to be dependent on one ultimate and absolute cause. Sir William Hamilton is by no means free from such views. So, again, God results from the tendency of our mind; we are forced to believe in Him, yet He is, therefore, not real in Himself, but is created and put over all things only by our ideas. Kant, as long as he speaks of the theoretical reason, explicitly draws all these consequences. Later he tried to avoid atheism by his criticism of the practical reason. Like him also other adherents of innate forms and subjective tendency contrived to retain God's existence by some subterfuge. Yet all shifts resorted to prove ineffectual, as we have already shown in the first article. Modern philosophers unscrupulously deduce from these principles atheism as the last conclusion. Their deduction is, indeed, legitimate. Quite consistently with Kant's theory have the idealists confounded God with man, and has the famous atheist, L. Feuerbach, said the Divinity to be nothing but humanity itself made the object of our thought.

What shall we say of this system of subjective tendency taken as a foundation for atheism? Our judgment is simply this: It rather leads to skepticism than to atheism, destroying both the subjective and the objective order, both mind and nature. First it destroys



reason, and in general all our cognitive faculties. According to it the intellect is not a power of knowing or representing within us things as they are in themselves, but of putting on them forms and relations which do not at all exist in them. The same has been said or may, with equal right, be said of the senses. This being so, there is no faculty within us fit for the attainment of truth; our thoughts and perceptions are illusive; still to trust any of our cognitions, or to think that things are in themselves as we know them, would be folly. Also the objective order is shaken to its foundation. The objects perceived, if considered as distinct from us and real in themselves, are delusions; the ground itself on which objective being rests, and the principles of which it is constituted, have vanished away. For are the causes not that which make up a thing? Are the intrinsic causes not the components of which a being consists, and the extrinsic the agents from which it has existence? But the components of which things are constituted, and the agents which put them into existence being taken away, what can still exist? Reality must, therefore, of necessity entirely fade away. If now we have to reject principles and theories from which evident falsehood is consequentially deduced, what ought we to think of the system of innate forms, the necessary consequence of which is skepticism, the greatest of all absurdities, and the last result of which is the destruction of all,—of cognition, of truth, of being itself? Indeed, such a theory must be utterly false and absurd. Hence one of the principal modern systems considered as a firm basis of atheism is nothing but a monstrous absurdity, leading to the universal denial of all that is.

Another parent of atheism is empiricism. It arrives at the negation of God from a point of departure quite opposite to that taken by idealism. It does not deny the existence of the outside world or confound it with thought, but it rather acknowledges the only reality to be that which is touched and experienced by our senses. However, among the empiricists we must distinguish two classes. Some of them allow man to have no other cognitive faculty than the sensitive; others grant us to be endowed with intellect, but deny the validity of all *a priori* cognitions.

Sensationalism, which disowns the intellectual power, is found already in antiquity, its principal forms being stoicism and epicureanism. In modern times, being revived chiefly by Hobbes and Hume in England and by Condillac in France, it was taken up by the materialists,—by Diderot, D'Alembert, De la Metrie, Helvetius, Holbach (author of *The System of Nature*) in the eighteenth, by Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner, Darwin in our own century. Of course, some improvements were added by our latest professors. Hobbes and Condillac thought sensation was a mere impression of the

material object on the senses, which was successively transformed into imagination, consciousness, judgment, and reasoning, without any activity on the part of the soul. In the opinion of our materialists sensation and, in general, all cognition is a function of the brain, as digestion is one of the stomach, not to use other meaner examples now in use among them.

The spiritual faculties of the soul being eliminated, it is evident that the existence of God can no longer be maintained. Our senses cannot represent to us the immaterial; hence they cannot perceive relations as such or know cause and effect, causality and dependence; nor can they attain a notion of the necessary, universal, and abstract. For this reason our judgments and reasonings about cause and effect, our ideas of the first cause or of pure spirits, are illusive, or at least cannot assure us of what the object is in itself. It is worth while to hear what explanation Hume gives of our mental operations in his *Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*. Our ideas, says he, are copies of our sensitive impressions, and differ from them only inasmuch as they are less forcible and vivid. The function of the understanding consists merely in associating them according to their resemblance, their contiguity in space and time, and their mutual relations as causes and effects. But how can we form the notion of causality? Sensation or experience, says he, does not exhibit us causality, for its object is solely the impression existing in our organs, the material phenomenon. However, since many phenomena always appear to us in a certain succession, and are thus also associated in our mind, we get habituated to expect that also in the time to come they will and must always follow one another in the same order. This habit of the mind inclines us to conceive things so as if one were the cause of the other, hence to draw the notion of causation, and to reason accordingly. The principle of causality, therefore, is not at all manifested to us by the objects we have perceived by experience, it is not even a postulate of our mind, but merely results from a habit, a quite subjective bent, and implies, on our side, a confusion of dependence and succession. It hence has no objective validity. Nor are we allowed to infer by it the existence of beings beyond the sphere of our experience as the causes of the phenomena we are cognizant of, and of the impressions we receive. Consequently, there is no possibility of knowing, with certainty, the existence of God and the reality of the outside world; for they are not attained but by the principle of causality,—the outside world as the cause of our impressions, and God as the ultimate cause of the world. Nay, God, as a pure spirit of infinite perfection, is not even an object of our thought; for we conceive Him only by indefinitely enlarging



the attributes of human bounty and wisdom. Hume in this way quite consequentially ends with universal skepticism.

Not all sensationalists adopt Hume's theory in full, nor do they proceed as far as he in the way of negation. Some think the principle of causality to arise not from a habit of the mind, but from an innate function of the brain. Hobbes and other English sensationalists shifted in some way or other to save God's existence and even the Christian religion. But it must be said that Hume was much more consistent than they, and that on the first principles of sensationalism he has built up a well-connected system of atheism and skepticism. He is undoubtedly for this reason in such high favor with our modern atheists.

Let us now discuss the question whether or not this kind of sensationalism, however well systematized, gives, in reality, a firm basis to objections against the existence of God. Above all we should ask any serious thinker, must not the fact itself that the sensationalists deprive man of reason and degrade him to the brute, that they void all intellectual knowledge of objective validity, that, if consistent with themselves, they must come to universal doubt, be taken as an evidence of the falsehood of their tenets and principles? Can these, teeming with consequences of so monstrous absurdity, be true and sound? We might with this one remark end the discussion. Still we shall enter into a closer examination of sensationalism and show its intrinsic contradiction more in particular.

First, the fundamental tenet of that system, to wit, that we have no other than sensitive cognition, is untrue and contrary to our experience. Sensation, as the sensationalists themselves say, cannot represent to us but individual bodies according to their material qualities, because the impressions on our organs are material, themselves, and refer only to an individual thing acting on us. But it is a matter of fact, daily witnessed by our consciousness, that we know properties of things and natures altogether immaterial. We know what is wisdom, sanctity, simplicity, necessity, truth, falsity, all which objects are simple, unextended, abstract from time, place, and individual existence. Again, we have universal ideas; nor are the universals we conceive collections, or do they consist in mere names which may be given to many things, as Hume thinks, but they are natures or attributes, which are or may be really found in many subjects, and can truly be predicated of each one of them. From universal ideas we form principles, likewise and in the same manner universal. We have notions also of spiritual beings. The most striking instance is the conception of Divinity itself. For we do not conceive it only as an indefinitely high degree of human wisdom and bounty, but as the accumulation of all perfections,

without any limitation, composition, or dependence, as wisdom, sanctity, power, life, being infinitely perfect and self-existent. With all these notions, particularly with that of God, the sensationalists are very well acquainted. For do they not, if we speak, understand what we mean by them? How could they else combat and try to exterminate them by their theories? They must consequently agree that, as we perceive the immaterial, we must have also immaterial powers of cognition.

Secondly, it is thoroughly false that the principle of causality rests on a confusion of succession and dependence and rises from a habit of the mind. We very well distinguish between succession and causality, and sometimes forcibly deny that one thing is the cause of the other simply because they follow one another. We even do not form the conception of causality from succession. We attain it in a quite different way. Whenever we see something to come into existence from non-existence, we must conceive it to have begun its existence dependently on another being. For as nothing can give what it does not possess, the non-existent cannot give itself existence, but must receive it from another existing being. This latter which has given existence we call cause, the former which has received it we call effect. Not on account of succession, therefore, do we imagine a thing to have been effected; succession, if regular, may at most afford a reason to attribute *certain* effects to *certain* causes. We thus also understand the principle of causality to be a universal truth. For not only this or that individual, if it comes into existence, must needs be produced, but whatever is such depends of necessity on a cause. Hence it is likewise evident this principle does not spring from a subjective tendency or habit of our mind, but is founded on the objective order. For the things themselves without us come into existence, and hence of themselves and independently of our thoughts require a sufficient cause, distinct from them, for their existence. The only subterfuge still open to the sensationalists would be to say that we do not directly perceive the things without us, but the impressions or representations within our faculties. So indeed they say, particularly Hume. But therein again they evidently gainsay experience. We are quite conscious of being directly cognizant of the things without us. Not even a sensationalist will ever be seriously convinced that when he converses he does not see or hear his friend himself, but an image existing in his brain; or that when he is beaten he is not touched by a cudgel from outside, but by a mere representation of such a thing; or that when fire has broken out in his house and threatens him with death, he is ruffled only by a subjective impression which he



may calm by cooling his blood with a pail of water. Such skepticism is not only absurd, but, outside lunatic asylums, impossible.

As the sensationalists set forth their fundamental tenets against experience, so they also continually contradict them. They degrade themselves to the brute, but want to be very intelligent, enlightened, and scientific. They reason; they pretend to have acquired a deeper knowledge of nature than other people; they are well versed in mathematics, physics, chemistry, mechanics; they make astonishing inventions and discoveries; they refute opinions opposed to theirs, and, above all, in defending their system they try to support it by reasons and claim for it truth and solidity. How can they perform all such mental operations? Certainly in no other way than by forming and making use of general notions and principles, by resorting to causes and sufficient reasons, by reducing the phenomena to general laws and searching into the intrinsic constitution of things, by perceiving the relations of beings to one another and discovering the intrinsic connection between them, and at last, by admitting all their reasoning to be in agreement with the real and objective order. But any such object they constantly deny that the senses can reach, as soon as a question arises concerning the existence of God or the immortality of the soul. Then they ever repeat that things and principles of that kind are beyond the sphere of our cognizance, that we cannot know anything but what strikes our senses, and will not even allow us to know the cause of our sensitive impressions, the outside world. Are they thus not intricated in evident self-contradiction? They are in the alternative either to grant the falsity of their philosophical system, the basis of their atheistical impiety, or to renounce science and intellectual activity. Not being able or willing to disclaim the latter, they are forced to gainsay every one of their tenets by their own doings and sayings, and to be living witnesses of the absurdity of their own theories. It would be useless to say more of this kind of sensationalism, so disgusting for every human being that is not to resign the dignity of mankind.

May perhaps those empiricists fare better who do not disown the intellect as an immaterial faculty? Francis Bacon, Lord of Verulam, is generally considered as the author of that system, though he by no means adopted all the tenets of modern empiricism. Bacon intended to reorganize science by the inductive method. The following were his leading ideas. He did not deny man's reason, yet thought it, if left to itself, inclined to fictions, prejudices, and barren disputations about mere names. To be useful it ought to apply itself to a thorough investigation of nature with the view entirely to subdue it to man and to make it subservient to his comfort; to be true it ought to be guided by experi-

ence alone. Sensitive experience is, therefore, in his own opinion the only way of attaining true and useful science. Hence the division, as well as the method of science, may easily be gathered. Only philosophy is science. Its object is threefold: God, Nature, Man, Nature, however, being chief among them, because of God and of the soul, since they are beyond our experience, little can be known with certainty. The method of science ought to be but inductive. In former times it was customary to rise immediately from single facts to universal notions and principles, and from them to infer new cognitions by demonstration *a priori*. But thus mere fictions were obtained, not true knowledge. Not to depart from truth and to know things as they are in themselves, we must first gather, by observation and experiments, a multitude of facts, then by comparison reduce them to order, and at last, by induction, deduce from them general laws. These ideas of Bacon's, laid down in his famous work, *Instauratio Magna*, exerted during the last three centuries a very great influence, not only on the development of natural sciences, but also on the study of philosophy and the tendency of mental culture in general. His views on the necessity of following the experimental method in all scientific inquiries were soon adopted by others, modified, and evolved into several philosophical systems. First in this line was Hobbes. Dropping the intellect as a cognitive power distinct from the senses, he gave rise to sensationalism of the worst kind. For the truest development, however, of Bacon's principles we may take Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. Locke grants the existence of the intellect, yet to a great extent denies the validity of its operations. The following is about the drift of his system: "From experience," says he, "all our knowledge is founded, and from that it ultimately derives itself. Our observation employed about external sensible objects or about the internal operations of our minds, received and reflected on by ourselves, is that which supplies our understanding with all the material of thinking. These two are the fountains of knowledge, from whence all the ideas we have, or can naturally have, do spring." Our senses, acted on by the particular objects without us, convey to the mind an impression by which we perceive the sensible qualities of the bodies; as heat, cold, yellow, white. In a similar way do the operations of our soul, by producing an impression on the mind, make themselves perceived, and thus furnish us with the perception of thinking, doubting, believing, and other actions. Such naked perceptions of the qualities of the bodies and of the actings of our soul are our simple ideas. In receiving them our understanding is merely passive; for they are but impressions stamped on the mind as on a mirror, which it can neither refuse, nor alter,

nor blot out, nor replace with others acquired by itself or from some other source. They once being received in the mind, the understanding begins to work on them; and it is this operation which is proper to man and distinguishes him from the brute. The acts of the understanding consist in combining several simple ideas into one compound one, and thus all complex ideas are made; in bringing two ideas together and setting them one by another so as to take a view of them at once without uniting them into one, by which way it gets the ideas of relations; in separating them from all other ideas that accompany them in their real existence, which is called abstraction and effects general ideas. Even the abstrusest conceptions, how remote soever they may seem to be from the senses or from our interior operations, are in this way framed by the mind's acting on the simple perceptions obtained from sensation and reflection.<sup>1</sup>

These ideas, simple and compound, are either real or fantastical. Real ideas are such as are conformable with the real being and existence of things; fantastical are such as have no conformity with the reality of being to which they are tacitly referred as their archetype. The simple ideas are all real; of the complex some are real, some fantastical. The abstract ideas are not real, for they are notions of genus and species, which are products of the mind, representing not the real essences, that is, the intrinsic constitution of things, but the nominal essences, the collection of qualities in which different beings agree.<sup>2</sup>

From ideas the mind proceeds to knowledge, which is the perception of their connection and agreement, or their disagreement and repugnance. Its truth is either real or verbal. "Truth is the marking down in words the agreement or disagreement of ideas as it is; falsehood is the marking down in words of the agreement or disagreement of ideas otherwise than it is." So far as between our ideas there is that agreement or disagreement which our words express, truth is verbal; so far as the ideas which we perceive to agree with one another, also agree with nature or are capable of real existence, truth is real. General propositions have no real truth, because the universal ideas underlying them and marked by our words are fantastical and cannot exist in nature; yea, we can seldom be certain of their verbal truth. Maxims, therefore, do not serve the investigation of nature, having no agreement with it; nor do they promote the advance of knowledge, because they are understood by one of the latest operations of our mind, and are, besides, of very little help to us in perceiving the agreement of ideas.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Essay Concerning Human Understanding, Book II., chap. i.-xiii.

<sup>2</sup> Book II., chap. xxx; Book III, chap. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Book IV., chap. v.-iii.



The psychological part of empiricism was by no author set forth so well as by Locke. All empiricists after his time, even the latest of them, the positivists, have built up their theories on his, taking his explanation of the workings of the mind as a basis for nearly all their tenets. Of positivism, however, we still have to say a few words. Its founder was A. Comte (died in Paris in 1857). In his opinion the object of human knowledge is no other than the phenomena of the visible world with their laws. Causes, essences, and universal principles derived from them, have no objective truth, but exist only in the subjective order of our mind; the value formerly given to them was the cause of the want of man's progress in philosophy. Wherefore, the object of our scientific inquiries is no more the absolute, but the relative; nor can theology, the knowledge of the supreme cause, or metaphysics, the knowledge of the abstract essences, be reckoned any further among the sciences. Both were necessary stages of the mind in its advance towards its last perfection, the true knowledge of nature; yet they hatched only chimeras. By experience and observation we become cognizant of the phenomena of nature and history; by science we reduce the phenomena experienced, according to the inductive method, to their common laws, that is to say, to the invariable order of their succession. The several laws drawn directly from particular phenomena may, by induction, be again reduced to a few others still higher in order and universality and common to several sciences. Such laws of a superior order are the seven highest sciences of mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, sociology, and moral, all which together, constituting one complete system, are called positive philosophy. A personal God, of course, existed no more for the French philosopher. However, man, naturally religious, cannot be without an object of worship. This Comte thought to find in humanity itself, as represented in the great men of all ages. Having accordingly organized a newfangled religion, a part of which was fetichism, he himself officiated as the high priest of humanity. But for this point his school was divided. Some faithfully followed all his ideas; others, headed by E. Littré, rejected his views on religion as inconsistent with his system and tried to satisfy their religious feelings with positivism.

From France positive philosophy spread nearly over all countries of the civilized world, and was enthusiastically received by a great many modern scientists, in England particularly, since Stuart Mill, Bain, and Spencer adopted its principles and its method in several of their scientific works.

It would certainly be very wrong to think that all empiricists are atheists; as Bacon, so Locke, and so even some positivists

condemn atheism. However, empiricism, as expounded by Locke and Comte, cannot but end in the denial of God's existence, if consistently adhered to and developed. First, we cannot even acquire a notion of a personal God, infinite in His perfection. For if we have no other materials of our thinking than the phenomena of this visible world attained by experience, and if all our intellectual activity merely consists in compounding, comparing, and dividing them, we cannot form the idea of the spiritual, simple, infinite, absolute, because it is impossible to compose such a being of material, extended, finite, and dependent elements. And even could we conceive God, we should not know whether or not our idea of Him was objectively true, He being beyond all our experience; and much less should we know whether or not He in reality existed, we having no principles to infer from them His existence by argumentation. For whilst syllogistical demonstration has become impossible for the want of universal ideas and axioms, induction does not reach Him. For by means of this we may from certain facts gather another one similar to them; yet God is far above nature and essentially different from all contingent existences. Atheism, therefore, is the natural offspring of empiricism, and is nowadays everywhere, but particularly in England and America, supported by empirical theories.

Has now empiricism so solid a foundation as to give atheism at least a fair semblance of truth? First, if we can know nothing but the phenomena of the visible world, the power of reason is, to a great extent, destroyed, and human is scarcely different from animal life. Not only are then the spiritual and supersensible objects beyond the reach of our cognizance, but also the nature of the material things, their intrinsic constitution and causality, are entirely hidden from us. Our mind is, as Locke said, no more than a dark room, where by the light of experience resemblances of the natural phenomena are let in, and by our intellect put in order, connected, compared, or separated. Science as the knowledge of things from their causes is no more. Our reasoning is as to all universal and necessary objects unreal and devoid of objective validity. Our loftiest ideas are mere chimeras. The freedom of the will is by many directly denied. Morality has no relation to a divine lawgiver, who is the source of all obligation, or to an infinite good to be obtained as a reward of virtue, or to be lost in punishment of vice. What is of a higher, spiritual nature, of eternal, unchangeable necessity in the moral order has become imaginary. Human nature can reasonably have no other tendency than to comfort, to the enjoyment of nature, to a merely exterior regularity in its actions. Man is but an animal which pursues fruition with more sagacity, skill, and refinement than ordinary

brutes. Hence there is, in many regards, scarcely any difference between sensational and intellectual empiricism. Practically it elevates man above the beast only by an accidental degree; theoretically it also leads to skepticism. For if we deny the veracity of reason as to its proper sphere of immaterial objects, may we not also doubt the truth of experience? Why should one cognitive faculty of man be essentially true, and the other by its intrinsic constitution tend to falsehood when inclining us with necessity to the firm belief in divine and supersensible things? How could it be possible to stultify rational nature, and to grant truth to sensitive nature? Should, if the higher part of man is unfit for truth, the lower be fit for it? Do not also the senses deceive us under certain circumstances, and do they not, to agree with the objective order, need to be guided and corrected by reason? What warrant, then, have we for their veracity?

There is only one way left to escape universal skepticism. The senses, it might be said, by their very constitution refer to the sensible things without us, as consciousness refers to the operations of the mind within us. Since, then, they both report their objects very distinctly as existing and even as acting on us, we must infer that they cannot possibly be fallacious. I very willingly grant this. But just the same reason speaks also for the veracity of the intellect. Being immaterial, it is proportioned by its constitution to immaterial objects, and most distinctly says the essences, causes, and universal principles to have objective truth without us. As by experience we do not perceive the objects without us but as they act or have acted on our organs, so we do not represent to us things by the intellect, but as they have in themselves and independently of us certain natures and constitutions, as they presuppose without us certain extrinsic causes, and imply certain intrinsic principles of action. The conviction forced on us in this regard by the intellect is as strong as that produced by experience with regard to the existence of the phenomena. We must, therefore, either admit the truth of reason, as well as experience, or maintain the falsity of both, and either condemn the fundamental tenets of intellectual empiricism or embrace skepticism.

Having thus, first, shown this kind of empiricism to lead to just the same absurd consequences as sensationalism, I shall, secondly, evince that it likewise cannot lay down its principles without contradicting them. It takes experience for the criterion of all truth, and then judges of the validity of intellectual ideas and the reality of immaterial objects, whilst experience does not know anything at all about them. The empiricists thus in a fundamental question go, against their tenets, far beyond experience. This I think to be the first and a most important self-contradiction of theirs.



Then, on the one hand, they admit the existence of the intellect as an immaterial faculty, and, on the other hand, destroy the objective validity of its operations with regard to objects proportioned to it. For, being immaterial, it must be able to attain also the immaterial, and fit to reach beyond the phenomena the nature of things. Hence they assert and destroy the intellect at the same time; for to maintain that a cognitive faculty cannot attain the object proportioned to it, is tantamount to denying its existence.

Besides, the empiricists are compelled to presuppose the truth of reason as to its universal notions and principles. It is true, they pretend to draw their conclusions and to gain their general laws and axioms by induction resting on experience. Let us, however, ask them, of what induction they make use, whether of complete or incomplete. To complete induction they cannot come by experience. For we can never experimentally know all the instances of a general law, past, present, and future; and, moreover, this kind of induction would not lead us to the discovery of new truth, but would only reduce our experience to a compendious formula. If they appeal to incomplete induction, which supposes several, but not all instances of a universal law to be known, then the question arises how they can proceed from a given number of particular instances to a general principle, or to other similar instances not yet reached by experience. The positivists generally own to make such inferences according to the law that the course of nature is uniform. They agree that this law of uniformity is the foundation of all induction. But, again, how has this most universal law come to our cognizance? Herein lies the great puzzle for the positivists. In solving it they do not agree themselves with one another. If we are to believe Stuart Mill<sup>1</sup> the general law of uniformity of all nature is known to us also by experience; first it is inferred from a few instances and by the tendency of our mind to generalization, without any doubt on our side, yet with no objective certainty; later it increases as to firmness in our knowledge as observation enlarges, until at last by a scientific and more careful induction from the different laws of less universal orders it obtains full surety. However, so the difficulty is rather more intricated than unravelled. For if the law of uniformity of all nature, inasmuch as it is really certain, is the final result of all our inductions that make known to us the less universal laws, how, then, can these latter be firm and certain? Have we here not a petition of the principle? Is not the conclusion already taken as a premise? This Stuart Mill would not grant. He seems to be of opinion that our inductions first give only probability, we being helped in making them by our tendency to gen-

---

<sup>1</sup> See *System of Logic*, Book IV., chap. iii. and xxi.

eralization, but that at last, from the connection and agreement of all the different laws, the universal uniformity of all nature is certain with full evidence. Even this throws no light on the question. So universal probability is made the mother of universal certainty. If each particular law is only probable and not doubted of on account of our tendency to generalization, it is very difficult to see how the whole of them is known with certainty. Is the firmness, which seems to rise from the agreement of all these probabilities, not also a result of our tendency to generalization? Moreover, this method adopted, the logical strength of induction decreases in proportion as the universality of the law inferred increases. The more universal a law is, the greater is the multitude of the instances comprised in it, the greater is our incapability of experiencing and examining them all, and the smaller the number of those we know in comparison with those we do not know. Nay, the whole of the individual instances, known to us from experience, is to the course of all nature what a pond is to the sea. For this reason a more universal law can according to Mill's method be inferred with but less probability, and the most universal is inferred with least probability. In all such conclusions we directly jump from a few instances to an indefinite multitude, and in the last conclusion we jump from the narrow sphere of our experience to the whole of nature for an unaccountable reason. Locke, therefore, the chief theorist of empiricism, was quite consistent when he thought induction to afford only probability. Hence the surety of science must be given up by the empiricists, just as well as the certainty of the unlearned with regard to future events was explicitly denied by them, against the conviction of mankind.

There is nothing left to them to redeem certainty but to resort to the theory of the ancients. We attain by the intellect, say they, the essential attributes of the things, not only as they individually exist in nature, but also as they may be abstracted from all accidental and individual modifications, and thus become common to many. If such attributes are simple, we may know them from one individual subject at once; if they are more intricate, we employ observation and experiments. In this latter case we make use of induction, which supposes the cognizance of a phenomenon in so many individual instances and under so various circumstances, that it cannot be attributed to an accidental quality of things in which it is seen, but must, in whatever manner, result from their intrinsic constitution and common nature. But the nature of beings is everywhere and always the same, since the components cannot vary, the thing constituted by them not varying. Hence we infer that the same things will always produce the same phenomena,

and will have the same qualities. This idea undoubtedly leads us in making inductions, and from it the rules are derived for performing them without danger of errors. Thus, however, it is to be acknowledged, we know the nature of things and the causes of the phenomena; we form by abstraction universal principles from universal notions, which are not fictitious, but are truly and really predicated of many things existing in nature. After all, then, the positivists cannot maintain the certainty which they claim for science but by contradicting their theory on universal notions and maxims.

Also in other regards they are forced to gainsay their tenets concerning the notion of essence and causality and the understanding of general principles. Mathematical theoremata they certainly do not prove by induction, but deduce them from the nature and definition of certain geometrical figures and the relation between certain quantities, experience giving us but the occasion to form an idea of them. Nor can they object that mathematical truth is not real; for they always apply it to the bodies without us and measure nature with it. By their scientific researches, they not only reduce the phenomena to a certain order in their succession, but also endeavor to find out the intrinsic constitution of things, the nature of the forces, the inward connection of the parts in the whole, the influence of one body on the other. What is this, if not an inquiry into the cause, essence, and nature of things? And when, for proofs alleged, they think their system to be true, and others to be false, do they not rely on the principle of sufficient reason? Again, in their deductions, they continually make use also of abstract and universal principles, which they take for certain and never try to prove by induction. We can scarcely read a page in the writings of a positivist without meeting with philosophical axioms admitted on immediate evidence. Besides, when they deduce new truths by reasoning and proceed to new discoveries, how do they know their conclusions to be right and true? Our reasoning must needs have certain rules as a criterion of its rightness, else it becomes arbitrary and loses all its claims to truth. Also the demonstrations of the scientists must, therefore, be made according to the laws of logic. It has been granted also by empiricists, as, for instance, by Haeckel, that the neglect of philosophy had the worst consequences for the natural sciences themselves, because it led them to strange and absurd deductions. Now which are these rules of logic, and how are they obtained? Not by physical or chemical experiments or by observation, but by applying to our argumentations the most universal principles drawn from the conception of being,—those of contradiction and of agreement and disagreement. Nay, without the principle of contradiction, taken either in an abstract or in a concrete form, we can have no certainty



at all; for of no proposition are we certain, unless we see its contradictory to be impossible. But no contradictory is impossible, if something can both be and not be, and all impossibility is at last resolved in that of being and not being at the same time. Yet this principle cannot be tested by experience, as not being is no object of our senses or our consciousness.

In many respects, then, do the positivists gainsay their theory. They admit and destroy the intellect at once; they deny man's capability of knowing causes, and continually inquire into them and presuppose their existence; they profess to make use only of induction, and cannot infer anything by it alone; they declare the notions of essences and the principles founded on them to be fictitious, and make frequent use of them, being forced either to do so or to give up all reasoning and even all certainty. They will hence allow us to consider as a very weak basis of atheism that system which they themselves contradict the more the more they praise it, and which supposed to be true, knowledge, science, and morality can subsist no longer.

It remains still to speak of materialism, now no less a support to atheism than positivism. These two systems are intimately connected, yet not identical with each other. Materialism regards the ontological, empiricism the psychological order; by empiricism it is maintained that we can know nothing but matter and its forces, by materialism that in reality there exists nothing but matter. However, they are generally adopted conjointly and upheld by each other. Materialism has been taught already in antiquity by the Ionian philosophers. After their age it has never disappeared from the literary world, yet it was never spread so widely among the educated classes as in our days. The general features of modern materialism we may give in a few lines. There exists nothing, it is said, but matter endowed with forces; because we experience no other being than matter, and whatever we do not experience is imaginary. Hence it is inferred that matter must be self-existent. For as matter is not experienced without force, so force is not perceived but in matter. Yet had matter been produced, it would have been effected by a force, and, consequently, force would exist before and outside matter. As matter is self-existent, so it is also the source of all that is. With necessity it develops motion, activity, order, and evolves itself to the different classes of mundane beings, to inorganic bodies, plants, brutes, man, all which do not differ essentially, but are more or less perfect combinations of material molecules and forces, and have successively by evolution or transformation risen from one another. Herein all modern materialists agree; this is the new gospel taught by all our latest oracles of wisdom and promoters of civilization,—by Spencer, Huxley, Dar-

win, Wallace, Grove, Bain, Lyell, Tyndall in England, by Vogt, Moleschott, Büchner, Schleiden, Virchow, Haeckel in Germany, by Geoffroy St. Hilaire, Naudin, Lecocq, Edgar Guinet, Ferrière, Gaudry in France, by Quadri, Omboni, Montegazza in Italy. If explained in detail, materialism must be divided into many branches and schools. For some of its adherents think that matter produced the different classes of beings by intrinsic tendency, others that it underwent its successive transformations by chance and in consequence of exterior impulses; again the transition from one species to the other according to some takes place at once, according to others little by little and with many intermediate forms.<sup>1</sup>

It is needless to remark that materialism is the grossest atheism and that all its tenets and principles tend to replace God with matter. We may, therefore, immediately begin to search into the grounds of this system and lay open its intrinsic contradiction. First, materialism implies all the absurdity of sensational empiricism. It degrades man not only to the beast, but even to brute matter; it denies his soul, intellect, free will, and in general any faculty distinct from merely material forces. Moreover, the first and fundamental principle of materialism rests on empiricism, on the tenet that there is nothing but what we experience by our senses. But this tenet, first, presupposes no intellect to exist, which is false and gain-said by the sensualists themselves, and is, secondly, admitted by the materialists by a petition of the principle. For does not the saying that there is nothing beyond the sphere of sensitive experience not already quite explicitly presuppose the non-existence of an intellectual power, of ideal truths, and of immaterial forces? Thus, while the reality of the intellectual order is to be searched into and tested by solid proofs, they take its unreality as the first and starting principle of all their inquiries; and while the existence of the immaterial is in controversy, they begin with asserting that there are no other than material objects. Wherefore their whole system is quite groundless and illusory. Having so started from a false presupposition, they cannot build up their theory without constant self-contradiction. They pretend experience as the only criterion of truth, and then positively reject the spiritual, immaterial, and ideal, though our senses or consciousness can of such things not know anything at all. They choose a judge whom they know to be blind, promising to stand by his decision; and then, because he cannot pronounce sentence on account of ignorance, they take his silence for a condemnation of the things brought to trial. Thus saying to stick to experience, they go far beyond it. But

---

<sup>1</sup> On Materialism, its several systems, and its refutation, see Father T. Pesch's, S. J., excellent work: *Institutiones Philosophiæ Naturalis Secundum Principia*. S. Thomæ Aquin. lib. iii., disp. i., sect. ii.

they also contradict it. Experience does not represent to us matter as self-existent, but, on the contrary, manifests such qualities of it as prove its being produced. We experience matter as finite and changing. But finiteness and mutability show a thing to be contingent, and hence to be brought into being by an absolute and first cause, yea, if it be the last subject of all phenomena and all transformations, to have been made out of nothing.

That matter cannot, on account of its inertia, pass by itself from rest to motion, from inactivity to activity, that it could not reduce itself by its own forces to the actual order and unity of the universe and hence required the influence of a highly intelligent orderer, we have already proved in the second article.

Nor can according to experience matter be said to be the source of life. Spontaneous generation, that is, the origin of living beings from brute matter, cannot be proved from one single instance, as the best naturalists openly confess. How, then, can the materialists, nevertheless, have recourse to it, to account for the phenomena of life? They tell us that, in former periods, many millions of centuries ago, there was on this earth quite a different condition of things, in which spontaneous generation was possible, though now, this condition being changed, it can be effected no longer. Is such an assertion based on observation? Or has it, if tested by experience, at least some small probability? Not even so much. The extraordinary conditions of which the materialists speak are known from chemistry and physics. Nearly all of them we may reproduce by art, yet no spontaneous generation was ever obtained; not one plant, and much less an animal, has ever in this way been produced. Many of the most learned scientists, therefore, reject spontaneous generation, and even some materialists confess that in admitting it they adopt something that seems to be absurd and unjustifiable, yet say that they were obliged to do so in order to avoid the still greater absurdity of creation. If, moreover, we call our attention to the difference between life and matter as shown by experience, the impossibility of such generation is undoubtable. The animate and inanimate bodies have quite opposite properties in their composition, size, figure, origin, destruction, and particularly in their operation and evolution. The inorganic bodies are inert; they do not act but inasmuch as they are acted on from outside, and then they react only on the outside body by which they were determined, yet never does their action terminate in their own intrinsic perfection. The organic beings, on the contrary, act much more than they are acted on from outside, and by their action terminate in themselves, because acting as a whole, they intrinsically perfect and develop themselves as a whole. Can now, by addition or combination of parts, a whole



arise which has properties repugnant to the nature of its components? Can of atoms, all of which act only on an exterior subject, a thing be constituted which perfects itself, not indeed like a mechanism in which one part acts on the other, the last again on the first, but by a process in which the minutest cell evolves itself to a wonderful organism, and this again continually preserves and augments itself? In such a transformation, in reality, an intrinsic impossibility is implied, because the whole would contain what is essentially excluded from the parts.

As life does not rise from matter, so; if we are to believe experience, one kind of living beings does not spring from the other. There is absolutely no instance known of a new species originated by the connection of two others, or generated by a stock of a different kind, or developed from a lower class. There are varieties within the same species, but there is no progress from one species to another; this is a law of nature as certain as that of gravity or attraction, proved not only by all the monuments of history, but also by the palæontological fossils found in the strata of the earth. Theories, therefore, contrary to these facts have no foundation, and must by natural science itself be considered as fictitious.

If between the different species of brutes there exists a strict separation, what, then, shall we think of man's origin? Experience, of course, knows of no human being that is the offspring of a brute. But even the possibility of a transition from merely animal to human life is inconceivable. In the very organism there is, with all resemblance, such a difference between man and brute, that as yet all attempts to account for the transformation of the frame of the monkey in that of man have utterly failed, and have been shown by the materialists themselves to be arbitrary and self-contradictory. Also Darwin's theory went out of fashion. A still greater difference between man and brute strikes us, if we examine the phenomena of the intellectual and moral order. The brute has skill for certain works from its birth, but does not by itself advance in it during the course of its whole life; it is unfit to learn arts and sciences; it cannot extend its knowledge by inferences, discoveries, and inventions, or utter its perceptions by language, though it is able to form sounds; it shows no perception of the supersensible, no consciousness, no freedom, no self-control, no election of means to a purpose, no desire of other than sensual gratification. But men by study and exercise develop their powers and acquire their adroitness; they greatly differ among themselves in their talents and their employments; they all judge of that which is beyond the senses; they inquire into the causes of things, and attaining general laws and principles extend, by reasoning, their knowledge indefinitely and discover new truths; they progress in sciences and

arts, and make use of languages rich enough to express all their conceptions; their faculties of intellect and will cannot rest but in infinite truth and infinite goodness, hence in a supersensible object; they reflect on, and have control over themselves; they have the idea of order and freely effect it, as in exterior things so also in their own doings; they take the invisible and external as a rule for their actions, and conceiving purposes regarding the future, invent the means to put them into execution. Shall we believe that this eminence of man above the beasts rises from a somewhat different combination of the chemical and physical forces, or from some material modifications of the brain? Indeed a very bold conception, of which of course the philosophers and theologians of the dark ages were not capable! If we reason but a little on the phenomena proper to the mind, we fully understand that the faculty perceiving the immaterial, the spiritual, the possible, the universal must be immaterial, that the power of the will endowed with freedom can impossibly be a bodily force, that the active principles by which we are enabled to return completely into ourselves by reflection, and to form the idea of the simplicity or unity of an object perceived, is of necessity itself simple and unextended. To judge, therefore, from our experience, there is in man a simple principle of action far raised above matter and quite opposite to it; whilst for the operations of the brutes an active power may be thought to be sufficient, which, though not physical or mechanical, still entirely depends on matter, and cannot act at all but with the forces of the same. Hence, as the immaterial spring from the material, man cannot be a transformation or higher evolution of matter, nor can he have been developed from the brute.

If, then, life in general does not result from matter, if one kind of life is not derived from the other, and if the intellectual life least of all could arise from an organic construction, there must be outside of matter a cause which has infused life into it, and a source which has imparted it an intelligent principle. Matter, therefore, is not the sufficient reason of all that is; on the contrary, it requires, in many respects, a superior cause distinct from itself. It presupposes a Creator who has brought it into existence, a principle of activity which has put it in action and reduced it to order, a source of life which has given it vitality, an intelligent being which has produced and embodied in it a simple, immaterial, rational soul.

Wherefore nature, also studied by observation and experiments, shows in all its stages the marks of a higher power that has acted on it; nor does it find anywhere else so full and satisfactory an explanation as in the book of Genesis, according to which God reduced matter, after having created it, from a chaotic state to order,

produced the different species of plants and animals, and at last made man to his own image and likeness.

To sum up in one word what was said of the several atheistic systems, they all either lower man to the brute or to matter, or declare his intellect to be fallacious and destitute of the power of perceiving the proper object. All the atheists first reason away the faculty of knowing the supersensible with certainty, then proclaim that they see no God, and at last infer that in reality there is none; a method just as absurd as skepticism. For they cannot deny reason but by reason, they cannot prove it to be fallacious and set forth their system but by supposing its dictates to be true; nor can they establish experience as the sole criterion of truth, and on that ground term the supersensible fictitious and imaginary without contradicting experience itself. True, in fact, is the saying of the Scripture: "The fool hath said in his heart there is no God." —Ps. xiii. 1.

From this the absurdity of atheism is fully evident. Man, before he can deny God, must first make an attempt of moral suicide; he must first throw off his dignity, degrade himself to the brute, renounce all truth and goodness beyond our senses, forego the happiness in an infinite object to which his soul tends with all its energy; he must put out the light of his intellect, of universal and necessary principles, of science, and all deeper knowledge, give up the freedom of his will, destroy the whole moral order with all its virtues, as justice, charity, purity; he must deliver up himself and all human society to the fury of the passions, to the tyranny of the stronger, to corruption, fraud, and violence. Still in attempting such a destruction of human nature he is compelled continually to gainsay what he asserts, to build up what he has tried to put down, to admit what he had denied, to wit, to maintain the eminence of reason, which he would disown, and to acknowledge the necessity of the moral order, which he hates. What a sad and sorrowful aspect! If we, moreover, see those who thus strive to bring to naught rational nature pretend to be our greatest benefactors and the wisest of all men, does not atheism present itself to us as a complete darkness of the mind, as a kind of frenzy impelling to self-destruction?

However, it would be wrong to consider atheism as a disease of the intellect alone. The root of this madness lies in the will, which applies the understanding to the consideration of truth, and, where there is no compelling evidence, can incline the same to give or refuse assent to opinions as they agree or disagree with the human passions. It is the will which, first out of pride rejects a divine lawgiver whom it ought to obey in all its action, and then, plunged in sensuality and overpowered by the lower appetites,



loathes all that is spiritual, holy, pure, and ideal. From this source flows atheism with all the systems leading to it,—idealism, empiricism, materialism. Hence St. Paul has derived it when he said that the heathens, because, having known God, they did not glorify Him as God, became vain and foolish in their thoughts and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into the likeness of the image of the corruptible man; and that, because they did not like to have God in their knowledge, they were delivered up by Him to a reprobate sense to indulge in the meanest vices, and still not to understand that they who do so are worthy of death.—Rom. i. 21.

Atheism, therefore, is no greater enemy to God than to man himself; it is both a struggle of the intellect against truth, and a most wicked aversion of the will to the true good; it is an entire destruction of all, not only because it denies the centre of all order and the source of all being, but also because it saps the very foundation of human nature and deprives man of everything that is sublime and beautiful, and that confers on him dignity and happiness. I do not know what still could be added to unmask the startling absurdity of atheism; for I think nothing can be more disgusting to rational nature than the destruction of all rational order.

To conclude, let us now in brief compare our modern systems of idealism, materialism, and empiricism with the scholastic philosophy. Who has not heard the former praised for the great results they have attained, for the extraordinary enlightenment they have produced in our times; and who has not heard the latter blamed for its unscientific method, for its fictitious, abstruse, and barren questions, for its servile subjection to theology? How often are not in our latest literature Locke, Hume, Kant, Comte, Darwin, Tyndall eulogized as the greatest geniuses, the reformers of science, the liberators of thought; whilst St. Thomas and the scholastic doctors are run down as patrons of darkness and ignorance? Yet facts, not phrases, ought to prevail on us. That idealism and materialism, just because they denied God's existence, end in the destruction of reason, in the overthrow of morality, in the degradation of man cannot be gainsaid, yea, is openly confessed. This is the great benefit they have bestowed on mankind. The scholastics, on the contrary, having risen from the contingent and finite world to the infinite and absolute being, have also lifted up man to the highest dignity. According to their doctrine, drawn from the greatest lights of Christianity, man is God's creature, formed after his likeness, endowed with reason, which is a spark of the divine intellect, and with a free will, which tends to the fulness of all good. And as in God they give man his most noble origin, so they lead him back to God as his last end, referring to this supreme and infinite good

all his actions, to render him worthy of enjoying it in endless bliss and contemplation. If they profess to be subservient to Christian revelation, they but open their eyes to a higher truth manifested on earth, and from far conduct man to a new and wonderful elevation, to a sublimer and supernatural participation of divine perfections. Which, then, has better deserved of mankind, ancient or modern philosophy? Which has better promoted the order and well-being of human society? Which has more regarded man's dignity and has endeavored to procure him true and imperishable good?

---

## "THE NEW FRENCH MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION."

A REPLY TO THE "HARPERS'" LATEST CALUMNY.

*Mentita est iniquitas sibi. (Ps. xxvi. 12.)*

THIS is the remarkable title of an article in the *Harpers' Monthly Magazine* for March, which I think very proper to take for my own. The day the article was published in New York this new minister had already fallen with his friend and supporter, M. Gambetta. It looked strange indeed to see the high hopes of M. Paul Bert, entertained by *Harpers' Magazine*, so soon vanished. "He," said this *anonymous* writer, whom we will call A. G., meaning *anonymous gentleman*, "has never fallen himself nor permitted his family to fall into the toils of the confessorial fraternity, and can be relied upon to prosecute the reform upon which he has embarked, until he shall have rescued the youth of France from the demoralizing influence with which the Jesuits have poisoned most of her seats of learning."

The time allowed him to prosecute this reform has been short indeed; and I wonder what the readers of that unlucky magazine must have thought of it when they saw him fall so soon. It is not, however, very surprising. On many other occasions when the Messrs. Harpers thought they had found an excellent opportunity for injuring "Romanism," it slipped through their fingers, and "Romanism" is to-day as vigorous as ever in the United States. In this last case the bright anticipations of A. G. cannot be any more realized, since they were all founded on the firm determina-

tion of M. Paul Bert, who has already disappeared from the scene. This remark, however, falls far short of an answer. The subject is a very serious one, and it shall be treated by me seriously. For although this brutal attack seems to be directed against the Jesuit order only; although the theological works which are misrepresented, calumniated, vilified, in this article, are those of a simple Jesuit, Father Gury; still a much higher end is aimed at, and it is well for Catholics to know it,—the object is to disgrace as far as possible the Catholic Church in this country. A. G., at the very beginning of his article, page 562 of the Magazine, speaking of the work of Father Gury, says (this time with justice and without exaggeration) that: "It has received the official approval of M. Guibert, Archbishop of Paris, . . . and it is in the hands not only of all the Jesuits, but of large numbers of the clergy of the Latin Church; for, according to the testimony of the Archbishop of Paris, 'this book enjoys the honor of having happily transformed the spirit of the French clergy in the last thirty years.'" A. G. might have said also that it is in the hands of many secular clergymen of the Catholic Church in these United States, with the full approval of the bishops.

More emphatically still he quotes in a note from a recent work by W. C. Cartwright, M.P., London: "No modern treatise can show a more formidable array of guarantees than Father Gury's *Compendium of Moral Theology*. It has been appointed in Roman Catholic seminaries, in all lands, as the standard manual of moral theology; it has been printed in every country, and translated into every tongue,"—this is not correct; it has nearly always appeared in Latin only, as it is not intended for the use of the people, but of clergymen. I hear, however, that there is an edition in German. "In the new issue of De Backer's *Dictionary of Jesuit Writers*," adds Mr. Cartwright, "there are enumerated no fewer than twenty-four editions."

If, therefore, the book "countenances," as M. Bert affirms, "debauchery, theft, incest, robbery, murder," the Catholic bishops who, everywhere, place it in the hands of the candidates for the *holy* ministry, "countenance" the same, and are guilty to the same extent as the writer himself. The Catholics, I repeat, ought to understand this thoroughly.

On them, to be sure, this furious onslaught on their Church cannot produce any impression, except that of disgust. They know full well that if there is on earth an institution founded by Christ for the fostering of virtue, the Catholic Church to whom they have the happiness of belonging is that very institution; that in her long history she has never been forgetful of that duty; and, that at this moment particularly, she is more zealous than ever in fulfilling the



moral task imposed on her by the Incarnate Son of God. The only effect that must be produced on them by this vile attempt will be an increase of affection for the great mother who has engendered them to God, and nourished them with the milk of righteousness.

But there is a great number of men who are not naturally so well disposed towards the Catholic Church, because they know her imperfectly. It is for them particularly that I have undertaken the unpleasant task of rebuking this anonymous gentleman. Many of them, no doubt, have been staggered at the boldness of his affirmations, and perhaps incline to believe that they are true, at least in part. But I am sure that a great number among them are not ready to accept all these charges on trust, and that they are willing to hear what can be said on the other side. Not only many Protestants, but many rationalists also are sensibly aware that the Catholic Church is a great and respectable body. Her ministers occupy everywhere on earth a commanding position among the people who listen to them, and to whom they preach, besides the dogmas of their faith, the rule of life which the gospel prescribes for them. They see that the Christian people who receive these instructions often, at least, lead edifying lives; and if some do not show in their conduct a sufficient correspondence with the moral precepts of the gospel, it always becomes clear that they are not obedient to the spiritual teaching of their pastors. Who of those well-minded Protestants and rationalists could believe that the moral training the Catholics receive publicly every Sunday in their churches, and the daily directions they hear secretly in the tribunal of penance, are made up of principles and conclusions tending to make of them "murderers, thieves, adulterers, and perjurers?" The respect which those parish priests (who have mostly been trained according to Gury's doctrine) experience from the community at large is well known. Chiefly when they die, as too often happens among us, is there but one voice, on all sides, from all parties, to praise them. How can this be accounted for if Paul Bert and A. G. are to be believed?

But particularly noticeable are the marks of deference shown on all occasions to our Catholic bishops. Except a few fanatics who have no eyes to see and no mind to reflect, all are unanimous in speaking well of our prelates; and this becomes most remarkable, and is expressed in terms of the highest praise, whenever the Church mourns their loss, as just happened at the moment I was writing this very paragraph. The death of Bishop Lynch, in Charleston, brought on at once from all sides expressions of the deepest feelings of veneration. And this was not an isolated case. In general it can be stated that, at the demise of Catholic bishops, if all the tributes of commendation which issue from the secular

press were printed together, they would form panegyrics equal at least to those bestowed on the best and most illustrious citizens of this republic when they die. Everybody knows it, and expresses no surprise, because they all are instinctively aware that the dead prelates were truly men of God when alive.

Still these are the men, I repeat, who knowingly and approvingly place the works of Father Gury in the hands of the clerical students in their seminaries. They themselves have deeply studied theology; they know how to discern the drift of any moral doctrine. If M. Bert and A. G. are to be trusted, these bishops must be monsters of hypocrisy, or rather sheer folly. Who can believe it?

Some people may complain that I am trying to transfer from my own shoulders to those of secular priests and bishops, the burden of most heavy accusations which are, in *Harpers' Magazine*, directed most particularly against me—a Jesuit. For I belong to the “confessorial fraternity,” as A. G. expresses it in neological language. Let no one be afraid of trickery here. I intend to face the music; and it may soon be a very pleasant music indeed to the ears of the anonymous gentleman. As an excuse for this apparent digression, I must assure every one who will consent to read me, that I would have begun to treat of this part of the subject, personal to me, from the very first line of this paper, had it not been extremely important to show that the attack is aimed at the Catholic Church, as much at least as at the *Jesuits*, and I believe I have done it sufficiently, if perhaps too briefly.

Before coming to the examination of Gurý's theology, which is the main object of denunciation, A. G. raves in his praises of M. Bert, and in the odious turn he gives to the previous history of the society of Jesus. Intending to follow him closely, these incidental considerations are first in order.

M. Bert has, it seems, risen high in the field of science in France; though looking at the list of books published by him, and complacently paraded by A. G., I must say he was not much prepared to speak of “moral theology.” His studies must have been very scant on that subject. He is, I think, chiefly known as a physiologist of the vivisection order. He must have, in his life, *vivisected* more dogs and rabbits than many other scientists. As the propriety of doing it is just now being warmly discussed in English reviews (see *Nineteenth Century* for January), I will not express any opinion, because I have none. I will not accuse him of having no other object in his experiments than to make these poor animals suffer. I will not call him on this account “a libertine, . . . a wretch, a debauchee, a *chenille*,” as A. G. pretends that some “Catholic journals” have done. But I will say this very deliberately, that M. Bert is well known to everybody in France for his ardent hatred of

the Catholic Church, which he does not attempt to conceal. Every one was surprised, nay scandalized, to see him appointed by M. Gambetta as minister of public instruction and *worship*. For worship was included in his attributions. All parties wondered at it, even the most ardent republicans, who openly remonstrated against it. For in France there is still a deep feeling of honor in many who have no religion, and they could not understand how this man could be placed in daily relations with the bishops whom he undisguisedly despised and vilipended. Every fair-minded man will agree that this is a bad preparation for discussing dispassionately such a subject as Catholic moral theology.

He particularly showed this *animus* in the part he took, in 1879, in the discussion of the celebrated 7th article of the Ferry Bill, by which "the Jesuits of all grades . . . were prohibited from engaging in the work of teaching." They had enjoyed this right, which in this country, thank God, is universal, since 1850. During nearly thirty years they had formed a generation of Christian young men, which frightened the *enemies of religion*. For, unfortunately, religion has enemies in France, a portentous phenomenon unknown in this country, thank God again. To prevent, therefore, the progress of Christianity legislation was to be changed, and the faculty granted by the French Chambers in 1850 must be withdrawn in 1879.

Since A. G. extols the conduct of M. Bert on this occasion, the point must be discussed, though very briefly. It is known that the 7th clause of the Ferry Bill which passed through the lower house was rejected by the members of the Senate, by whom, consequently, the Jesuits were considered worthy of teaching. There was no possibility of bringing the two houses to an understanding; thus the 7th clause was rejected; still it had been made a cabinet question by the ministers, who, nevertheless, kept their portfolios,—a strange way of showing respect for parliamentary rules. By a series of intrigues, owing to which obsolete laws were revived against Jesuits and many other religious orders, those very men whose teaching had been approved by the Senate were thenceforth considered as outcasts, having no title to the name of Frenchmen, and they were forthwith expelled from their own houses, from their own property, of which they have not yet recovered the usufruct.

The discussion of this very intricate affair would carry us too far; but people must still remember how men in England, and in this country, used to parliamentary and legal proceedings, were surprised and shocked at this turn of affairs. Those obsolete laws had been allowed to remain silently in the statute-book, some of them a hundred years. Many of them were known to have been only revolutionary laws to which no obedience whatever was due. Their sudden revival was an outrage, an act of tyranny. People



knew it so well, that in the course of these proceedings more than two thousand magistrates, known for their legal knowledge and integrity, gave up their official positions rather than contribute to the odious execution of those *laws*. This affair, I think, is still under protest, and the discussion of this high-handed injustice will revive as soon as there is true liberty in France.

This is the great achievement in which M. Bert took a prominent part. He was then only a deputy, but having to report particularly on the case of the Jesuits, he called them, according to A. G., "a sect which, wherever it has found a home, has provoked civil war; a sect which, at one time or another, has been cursed and hunted out of nearly every country in Europe; and every member of which, under the strict enforcement of the laws of France, should be sent at once to the frontiers." This is the way those gentlemen write the history of their own time. I shall say a word on it by and by.

He also "devoted himself more especially to exposing the immoral doctrines of the Jesuits, from the days of Pascal to our own time; and demonstrating their continual persistence in teaching the odious doctrines denounced in the *Lettres Provinciales*, not only to adolescents, but to children of tender years." The discussion of the "cases of conscience" of Father Gury, will soon show on which side is "immorality;" but I will say here that every sensible man must be more astonished still at the *continual persistence* of the enemies of the Jesuits in referring to the *Lettres Provinciales* of Pascal, which have been a hundred times confuted in every particular, and whose mendacity has been chiefly exposed lately by the Abbé Maynard, in two compact volumes, which leave nothing to be added on the subject. No discussion of it is possible here; still a few words, conclusive enough, will presently be added.

A. G., however, in his garbled account, has the candor to acknowledge that "there was but one possible defence that could have any weight in France against the charges of M. Bert,—that was a prompt denial of their truth. The Jesuit party *did* deny them, and accused the orator—M. Bert—of misrepresenting and falsifying the authorities he cited." His answer to this *defence* of the Jesuits must be examined with some care. The chief thing nevertheless, the proof that he has *misrepresented and falsified his authorities*, will be abundant only when the theology of Gury is discussed.

His first reply to the denial of his adversaries is rather startling: "Pope Innocent XI. denounced and anathematized in detail pretty much all the doctrines of the Jesuits which Pascal had held up to public scorn." I answer, that he did nothing of the kind; if he had, all the Jesuits would have bowed to his decision, and acknowledged Pascal as their conqueror. It is true that some Jan-

senists—not yet unmasked probably—denounced at Rome a multitude of propositions of unsound morality, which, according to them, represented the doctrine of probabilists and of Jesuits. They were examined, as is always done at Rome on the occasion of such denunciations. In 1679 Innocent XI. condemned sixty-five of them. But in his decree, which is given in full, even now, in all extensive treatises of Catholic moral theology, it was stated that they were condemned, such as they had been expressed in the denunciation, *ut jacent*. The names of the pretended authors to whom they were ascribed were not mentioned in the decree. It was not forbidden to read the books from which they were said to be extracted. The Jesuits continued to teach at Rome as they had done from their first introduction there. They proved in a book published at that time that those propositions were opposed to the common doctrine of their moralists. A subsequent examination showed that in the *denunciation* most of these propositions were so loosely put together or even broadly falsified that the authors to whom they had been ascribed could not recognize them as their own. Finally the same Pope soon after proscribed the reading of three libels which were published in quick succession in order to prove that these propositions were extracted from Jesuit authors. This is sufficient, I think, for this point. Innocent XI. did not condemn Jesuits in proscribing these sixty-five propositions.

As to the inconceivable idea that Innocent XI., in this affair, took up the cudgel for Pascal against the Jesuits, it is sufficient to say that he must have known the fact that Alexander VII., one of his near predecessors, had solemnly condemned the *Lettres Provinciales* as soon as they appeared. The ink with which that decree had been signed was not yet faded; and if Innocent had reversed it, the admirers of Pascal would not have let the whole world remain in blissful ignorance on that subject. It is too absurd on the very face of it. Why, those celebrated *Letters* have been condemned by all the authorities of the Church on whom the duty devolved of examining them. The head of the state in France—Louis XIV.—had the book burned publicly in Paris by the hand of the hangman, as an infamous libel, Voltaire himself has declared in his *Siècle de Louis XIV.* that "*tout ce livre porte sur un faux fondement; ce qui est visible.*"

A second reply to the denial of the Jesuits is contained in the pregnant remark of A. G., that their denial was not accepted at that time, since in spite of it "they were hunted like so many rattlesnakes out of every Christian country, even out of Rome, and their order placed under the ban of the Church by the memorable brief of Clement XIV. in 1773." The last part of this remark of A. G. claims first our attention.

What reasons had Clement XIV. for suppressing the Society of Jesus? In his brief—it was not a papal Bull—after having detailed at length the immense and peculiar favors granted by the Popes, his predecessors, to the society founded by St. Ignatius of Loyola, he solemnly proclaims the fact that there had been, and there were still, endless *accusations* against them. Does he declare those accusations to be true, and does he suppress the order on that account? The most attentive reader of the document will not find this to be the case. He may insinuate here and there that individuals of the order had been guilty of faults quite reprehensible; nothing more, and it is not surprising in a body of 22,000 men. As the present question regards *the morality of their casuists*, and A. G. pretends to reply to the denial or defence of the Jesuits on this subject, I have looked into the brief *Dominus et Redemptor* for this purpose; and I have found only two short passages in which Clement XIV. speaks of it. He says in the first: "There arose everywhere violent *contestations* on the doctrine of the order, a doctrine which several persons *accused* of being totally opposed to the orthodox faith and to good morals." The Pope does not add that he agrees with the accusers. In another passage a little further on, he speaks again "of *accusations and complaints* against the society" on several subjects, the last being "the usage and interpretation of those maxims" (of morals of course), "which the Holy See had justly proscribed as scandalous, and evidently detrimental to good morality." The German Protestant, Schoell, in his *Cours d'Histoire des Etats Europeens* (tom. 44, p. 85), resumes the whole in a short paragraph: "In this brief neither the doctrine, nor the morality, nor the religious discipline of the Jesuits, are condemned. The complaints of the secular governments against the order are the only motives alleged for their suppression." In fact the Jesuits were sacrificed for the sake of peace; but alas! their destruction, instead of bringing peace to the Church, increased the confusion then prevailing in Europe, which ended in the most virulent social and political revolutions, with the enslavement of the Church in many European states.

As to the subsequent restoration of the order by Pius VII., and the agreeable pleasantry of A. G., who sees in it an evident impeachment against papal infallibility, the simpleton must be left this time in his ignorance. I suppose that, in his opinion, if Leo XIII. ventures, on some bright morning, to predict that the good weather shall continue in the afternoon, which, however, becomes stormy, the dogma of papal inerrancy is instantly falsified! A. G. speaks also of Pius IX. having suppressed and afterwards restored the Jesuits. I would like to know when and where.

A third reply to the denial or defence of the Jesuits is contained



in a single and short sentence, which runs thus: "It was the same defence which they made to the report and decree of the French Parliament in 1762, but which did not prevent their order from being hunted like so many rattlesnakes, etc." There is no possibility of writing here the history of that celebrated decree of suppression by the French Parliament in 1762, against which the Jesuits were not allowed to *defend* themselves. A. G. writes but a sentence on the subject, I must confine myself to a paragraph. The detailed account of it can be found in many books and pamphlets still extant. Any American will directly understand my short sketch and immediately declare that it was an outrage on justice. The French Parliaments (in the plural) were simply courts of law—not legislatures. Each province of the kingdom had its own. They answered to our Supreme State Courts. There was no Supreme Federal Court as in this country, the Parliament of Paris having no supervision over the others. The first essential duties of courts of law are: 1st, *fairness* to the accused, and 2d, *competence*. Fairness is carried out when the accused is allowed full freedom for his defence. Competence in civil tribunals limits their action to civil, political, or state affairs. Both were shamefully set aside. Not only were the Jesuits not allowed full freedom for their defence, they were not permitted to appear in court by themselves or by counsel. They were only *commanded* to hand over to the courts the book of their constitutions, whose every clause was twisted into horrible meanings, without granting them the faculty of rebutting such an infamous proceeding. It was far worse than the arbitrary conduct of all the Star Chambers that ever sat in England. This cannot be gainsaid; it is true history. With respect to *competence*, it was still worse if possible. The courts of law in France had always been limited to civil cases, as in every civilized country. Any man belonging to a religious order, guilty of heresy, of violating ecclesiastical canons, etc., had to answer before the *ecclesiastical* tribunals, the bishops and the Pope at their head being the highest and supreme authority in such cases as these. Who will believe in this country that in 1762 the French Parliaments condemned the Jesuits for "favoring the Lutherans, the Calvinists, and other innovators of the sixteenth century, for reviving the heresy of Wyckliffe, etc.," for many other violations of mere ecclesiastical discipline? Still it is a fact preserved in the archives of France. The king, highly displeased at these proceedings, assembled the bishops, who came in great number to Paris—more than fifty—and all, with the exception of six, openly expressed their sorrow in case the order was destroyed; and unanimously (including the six prelates of an adverse opinion) pronounced the Jesuits men of an austere and pious life. The Pope meanwhile—it was then Clement XIII.—remon-

strated with all his power against this shameful persecution. The Jesuits, therefore, were declared not guilty by the *proper* tribunals.

The courts, consequently, which destroyed the society in France, in 1762, were neither *competent* nor *fair*. Their action has been condemned by all right-minded historians, by Protestants particularly. If there were *rattlesnakes* in the case, this word cannot be applied to the Jesuits, but to their adversaries, who were, most of them, Jansenists or infidel philosophers, and consequently led in their decisions by a deep animosity, which in itself would have constituted an absolute incompetence to sit as judges.

The same historical verdict would be pronounced if the expulsion of the Jesuits from Portugal, Spain, Italy, etc., could be examined here. There have been, in the whole range of human history, few monsters of cruelty like Pombal in Lisbon, few fools on the throne like Charles III. in Madrid, few hypocrites ministers of state like Tanucci at Naples. These were the rattlesnakes that hunted out the order. But this answer of mine, though altogether unsatisfactory for so important a historical fact, is long enough when compared to the unsubstantiality of the attack which A. G. has *admirably* compressed in a dozen words.

So far I have answered all the most offensive remarks of A. G. on the previous history of the Jesuits. This subject is so vast that the few observations to which I have been obliged to confine myself appear trifling and of scarcely any importance in so momentous a question. But M. P. Bert—though undoubtedly the affair is weighty in his eyes—has been in fact satisfied with discharging a few poisoned arrows into the hated centaur, and A. G. has faithfully imitated his master. I cannot become their compeer. I cannot tell them, "You are too mild in your attack. I might uncover to you sources of invectives against the Jesuits of which you are blissfully ignorant. You are not the first writers in that pleasant literature. You have had ancestors more heavy-weighted than you." According to A. G., M. Bert has written *La Morale des Jesuits* in "a volume of 665 duodecimo pages." I could show him folios of the same kind of stuff; but as the amiable A. G. has been satisfied with giving us in *Harper's Magazine* a few scraps only of that farrago, I must content myself with briefly examining and analyzing it, to see its nature. The reader will, I am sure, agree with me that the sooner we have done with it the better, and there is no need of plunging into the duodecimo volume of M. Bert, nor into the folios which I could procure him. This will suffice also for the reason that the main object here is to treat the question for this age, and the ponderous tomes of two hundred years ago would not do. "M. Bert," A. G. has remarked, "determined to show not what the Jesuits taught in their schools two hundred years ago,

but what they were teaching then, in the year of grace, 1879-80." Let it be done in this brief way by all means, and I am heartily glad that we have at last come to the main point.

Until this moment I think I have fairly followed M. Paul Bert's accusations, such as they have been, *condensed* in the loose phraseology of his mouth-piece in *Harper's Magazine*. But from this out I intend to be more strict still in quoting and dissecting whatever is contained in the remainder of the article, because what precedes is only the introduction to his great object, which is the complete exposure, as he thinks, of Gury's moral theology, that is, of Jesuit immorality.

He begins with an awful solemnity: "It would be difficult for any one who has not read Gury's books and verified the language quoted by M. Bert, to believe it possible that such doctrines as he will find there are not only printed, but taught in schools of theology by persons calling themselves Christians, or that there is any race of people so degraded in civilization as to listen to them." The presumption, however, is that the Catholic bishops and priests who approve of the doctrine of Gury have a right "to be called Christians," and that they belong to "a race of people which is *not* degraded in civilization." It seems only that they do not see in Gury's books what M. Bert has discovered, and that they attach another interpretation to his words. The sequel will soon show who is right. That A. G. "has *verified* the language quoted by M. Bert," I do not believe, and I feel a strong inclination to think that he has never handled the works of the Jesuit theologian. M. Bert may have had some of these books in his possession, but if he had read them he certainly has misquoted and mistranslated them.

Immediately before condescending to quote those dreadful "cases of conscience," which teach, according to M. Bert and his faithful disciple, A. G., such an easy method of committing "murder, incest, theft, lying, perjury, etc.," with a safe conscience, there are some considerations on that word conscience which deserve attention. The article in the magazine says: "By an infinitely elaborated system of definitions, classifications, divisions, and distinctions, every principle of right and wrong is so qualified and narrowed that little remains but a mass of petty aphorisms, which may be, and to all appearances are employed as often to oppose as to sustain each other. . . . Conscience, for instance, is distinguished into right and erroneous, certain or doubtful. Then come secondary divisions into conscience vincibly erroneous and invincibly erroneous, etc." They quote here faithfully Father Gury; but that "he distinguishes between true truth, doubtful truth, and false truth," as they directly after allege, I deny *in toto*. It is only the modern agnostics, for whom there is no absolute truth, who



can use such language. All Catholic theologians, including Father Gury, maintain that in natural religion, as well as in revealed faith, truth is invested with the prerogative of infallibility; there cannot be a half truth; truths of different orders cannot be opposed to each other. Father Gury would be condemned by his superiors and by Rome if he maintained a different opinion. In his belief truth comes from God, and must always be admitted in its entirety.

With regard to conscience, however, every one who is not a fool knows that it is sometimes right, and must be obeyed, sometimes erroneous, and must not be obeyed. The conscience of that pretended Christian who a few years ago killed his son, in order to imitate Abraham, was certainly erroneous. If he had been a Catholic his priest would have told him so, because he would have studied the doctrine of Gury; and Gury is right when he makes those distinctions, divisions, etc., which are necessary to come to a right understanding of a "case of conscience."

The objection which Dr. Littledale, a renowned ritualist in England, made against Catholic moral theology, a short time ago, amounts nearly to the one proposed by P. Bert and A. G. This strange Anglican-Catholic, who knows theology better, however, than either M. Bert or A. G., complained that casuistry in the Romish Church "was a system for dealing with separate cases of sins." He would have preferred, I suppose, that sins should be considered in the lump, not in their *distinctions and divisions* of lies, thefts, murders, etc. Father Ryder of the English Oratory simply remarked in his spirited *Reply to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons,"* that it must be so, because every sin is a "separate case;" the confessional implies a "dealing with separate cases." The book of Father Gury could not be of any use to a student of moral theology unless by bringing on distinctions, divisions, definitions, etc. As to the reproach that by doing so "nothing remains but a mass of petty aphorisms, which may be or are employed as often to oppose as to sustain each other," I reply, that the object of those distinctions, etc., is not to oppose or tally aphorism to aphorism, but to come at last to a moral decision deduced from all the circumstances of the case. That this is opposed to morality and promotive of moral wrong is one of the most strange assertions I ever heard in my life.

It is high time to come at last to that detestable work of moral theology which is, it seems, calculated to horrify mankind and render the Jesuits odious to all men who still preserve in their souls an innate sense of virtue. M. Bert and his echo in *Harpers' Magazine* say with justice that there are two distinct works of Gury: 1st, *His Compendium of Moral Theology*, in two volumes, and 2d, *His Cases of Conscience*, in two volumes also. But they

forget to mention a very important circumstance, which I must supply here. It is this: In the second work each case of conscience has a peculiar reference to some particular passage of the first work, the *Compendium*. Often this reference is pointed out at the end of the "case," by the words *vide Compendium* (in such or such place). This is invariably done when it might be difficult for the student to find out the passage. When only a dunce could miss it, these words are omitted. For a complete stranger to theological studies to snatch at the second work, and throw the case and its decision under the eyes of the people at large without referring to the moral principles explained in the *Compendium* is, to say the least, disingenuous. On many occasions it becomes a positive act of calumny; and my task, in this part of it, shall mainly consist in undoing the wrong of which the accusers have been guilty by referring to the *Compendium*. A. G. probably did not see this, I must give the devil his due, because he blindly followed M. Bert, his leader; but this last gentleman must have been aware of it if he has any sense, because he certainly had in his hands the books of Father Gury, and he could easily perceive the intimate connection between the two works of the Jesuit Father.

To give to an ordinary reader a still clearer idea of this disingenuousness, as I have called it, it suffices to compare it to the folly or guilty captiousness of a man who, reading in a lawyer's speech before a court of law several decisions, based on precedents, authorities, etc., which were as usual merely quoted and not given *in extenso* by the lawyer, would represent him as a knave, trying to foster injustice by loose principles of morality, without paying any attention to the details of precedents and authorities he had merely quoted. It might frequently happen that the speaker would be accused, by the nincompoop listening to him, of advocating theft, robbery, if nothing worse. The two cases are perfectly alike; and the reader of my very imperfect defence of Gury's theology, being warned beforehand, is now prepared to listen to the very strange cases which I have now to dissect and to analyze.

I must give the first case in the text of *Harpers' Magazine* only, because, in spite of all my endeavors, I could not find it either hinted at in the *Compendium* of the Jesuit, or laid down in detail in his *Cases of Conscience*. This gives me the occasion to remark that my task was an arduous one. I had to ferret out the iniquity of the accusers; and in order to merely find out the texts which they translated into English with an apparent boldness and fairness, I was left perfectly in the dark. In not a single one of them is the place where they are supposed to be in the Jesuit author, as much as mentioned. Still, the two works together contain 3246 pages octavo; namely, 1787 for the two volumes of the *Compend-*

ium; 1459 for those of the *Cases*. I will not accuse those gentlemen of want of charity in my regard; but I am uncharitable enough to imagine and to say that evidently they did not wish to render easy any answer to their foul accusations. I have, however, I think, succeeded as well as could be expected.

Let us come to the first "case," brought by M. Bert, as copied by A. G.<sup>1</sup>

*Question.* "Adalbert, wishing to kill his enemy Titius, killed his friend Caius. Has he sinned, and ought he to make restitution?"

*Answer.* "Adalbert ought to be held guiltless of the homicide, if he had not been able to foresee the death of Caius; if, for example, he had sought to hit no one but Titius. The reason is that this exterior act is not prejudicial in principle to Caius, whom he has involuntarily killed; consequently he is not liable to make restitution to his heirs."

This simply is an out and out calumny. As stated above, I have been absolutely unable to find this case, or anything like it with regard to *homicide* in the four big volumes of Father Gury. But, independently of this, he could not have given this decision in his *Cases of Conscience*, consistently with the principles laid down in his *Compendium*. First, he could not say that Adalbert *had not sinned*, because he states positively in the *Compendium*, like all other Catholic theologians, that a simple wish of committing a crime, is a crime of the same species as the act itself would be; so that the wish to murder must be considered as murder, since Christ says so of adultery, in Matt. v. 28. This is affirmed by Father Gury in his treatise of *Sins (de peccatis*, ch. I, Sins of Thought). As to the act of murder, it would be too long to go, in this place, through the whole tract of Father Gury *On the Fifth Precept of the Decalogue*, which treats of anger, homicide, murder, etc. Should the friend

---

<sup>1</sup> It is perfectly true that I could not find this case in Gury, in spite of all my efforts. But since this paper was sent to the printer it has been pointed out to me. I do not think it necessary to change anything I have written, because what I have said explains the case fully; but I must add a few words on the translation of M. Bert, which is altogether faulty.

In the "question" P. Bert makes the Jesuit ask, "Has he sinned, and ought he to make restitution?" This is not in Gury, who does not intend here to speak of sins of intention.

In the "answer," the following is the true translation of Gury, which is very different from that of M. Bert: "Adalbert must be excused from sin *with regard to the homicide he has committed* (namely, that of Caius), if he could not possibly foresee the killing of Caius; for instance, *in case he had* (before shooting) *examined if there was no danger of striking somebody else*. . . . Therefore he is not liable to make restitution to his heirs. *It would be otherwise if he had not taken any precaution, or if he had dimly foreseen the killing of Caius.*" F. Gury thinks, like all sensible men, that whatever happens through mere accident is not imputable. I have italicized the places whose translation by M. Bert is altogether unfaithful, and changes entirely the meaning of the author.



of M. Bert object to any of his decisions in the *Compendium*, let him quote the passage, mentioning the place, which he never does, and an answer shall not be long forthcoming. Any fair man, Protestant or not, who should read Gury and be able to understand his text,—the book has never been translated into any modern language except, it seems, in German,—would not think that the author is "degraded in civilization," according to A. G.; but he would find his doctrine always consonant with that of the Gospel, with the dictates of reason, and the moral *consensus* of all wise men in past ages. This is true of all Catholic theologians, but expressed by Gury with perhaps more clearness and precision than by many other of our moralists. This is probably the cause why the book has been introduced into nearly all Catholic seminaries.

Adalbert, therefore, has *sinned*, not only in thought and desire; but Gury, according to his principles, would never declare him "guiltless of homicide," chiefly for the reasons assigned in the pretended quotation which, for my part, I cannot understand; and I can say that I always understand Gury.

But from the expressions which follow, the case is also one of restitution; and the supposed author asks "if Adalbert is liable to make restitution to the heirs of Caius?" This is very different from the question of murder; but I repeat this particular case of Adalbert, and the answer I could not find in Gury's book. There is, however, the second one quoted by A. G., which may throw some light on the first; because in Gury's *Cases of Conscience* there are two which look like this one of Adalbert, considering the only question of restitution. Therefore, let us come to the

*Second Case*—"Blazius, wishing to injure his enemy Caius, determines to shoot his ass. He misses the ass, and kills the cow of Titius, sleeping behind the hedge unseen.

*Question.* "Is Blazius liable to make restitution for the ass which he missed, or the cow which he killed?"

*Answer.* "He is not. Certainly not for the ass which escaped; neither is he for the cow, since he had not foreseen this misfortune, nor been able to anticipate it."

M. Bert's object here is to amuse his readers at the expense of a mere fool—a Jesuit. But very likely it is out of this case that he *fabricated* the one of homicide on the part of Adalbert. The reader comparing both will easily see that there is a strong resemblance between them.

There are truly two cases in Gury's book which look exactly like this one of M. Bert, except as to the decision, and this is the main point. In the mind of Father Gury they were evidently correlative, and he needed both to explain his thought fully. To quote only the first would be simply a misrepresentation of his doctrine. The

names of the supposed persons are different also from those given out by M. Bert, but the change of names is the affair of this gentleman. I quote the Jesuit author exactly as I find his text.

*First.* "Lupian, anxious to injure his enemy Sylvan, perceives his calf grazing in the lot of its master. Directly he fires at it, but in vain; instead of the calf he kills the cow of Martial, which was quietly stretched behind a hedge unseen.

*Second.* "Cletus, wishing to injure Peter, his enemy, goes at night to devastate his vineyard; but it is a great blunder. Peter had a few days before sold this vineyard to Paul, the friend of Cletus, who soon learns with surprise that he has injured his friend, not his enemy."

The question is only one of restitution, and of strict justice. Hence it is found in Gury's book under the heading, *De injusto damnificatione*, "of damage unjustly perpetrated on the neighbor." The *wish* to injure is a different thing, which the author does not examine here, and which he would declare to be a grievous sin, according to the principles laid down in his *Compendium*. The necessity of repairing the damage being the only question to be discussed, he gives for the first case a different decision from that of the second. He says of the first that Lupian is not *bound* to pay either for the calf which has not been touched, nor for the cow whose presence was altogether unknown to him, and which was killed by mere accident. He is no more bound than a man who in hunting kills a horse which he could not see. Of course, I repeat that the question of *sin* is not examined here; and the decisions of the courts of law are always reserved by Father Gury, as not being of his competence. Strict justice in repairs for damage is always aimed at; the question of charity is quite different. If the injured man is poor, Father Gury, as well as all Catholic theologians, requires compensation *ex debito caritatis*, from a duty imposed by Christian charity.

The third case, which ought to have been, but was not mentioned by M. Bert, and which must necessarily be connected with the second, renders the meaning of Father Gury clearer. "Cletus," he says, "is bound in justice to pay damages, because all the conditions required for it exist in the present case; first, a grievous sin; second, an unjust act; third, an act productive of real injury." Explaining himself better still at the end of the discussion, he adds: "The fact of the vineyard belonging to Peter *or* to Paul has nothing to do with the question of justice, but is a mere question of names." The opinion of Father Gury on the subject is simply this: "If the injury inflicted on another is the result of mere accident, the object not being even known as present, there is no obligation in *justice* to repair the damage. But when the injury falls

upon an object well known, visible, intended in fact, compensation must be paid, though there is a mistake about the name of the owner."

I leave it to the reader to decide if this discussion can considerably add to the reputation of M. Paul Bert for honor, truthfulness and fair dealing with a Jesuit. He has evidently followed the advice of Voltaire to his fellow-conspirators against the Church: *Mentez, mes amis, mentez, il en restera toujours quelque chose*. But the best is to come before long.

Fourth case, on lying, equivocation, mental reservation: This is a lively subject. The writer in *Harpers' Magazine* prefaces it by remarking that Mr. Gury's views of lying Ananias and Sapphira would have thought liberal. I beg his pardon. The positive untruth of those two wretched converts was called by St. Peter "a lie to the Holy Ghost" (Acts v. 3); and Father Gury would not have considered it a *venial* sin. M. Bert, it is true, seems to think there are no venial lies, and that all untruths are equally grievous sins. He complains in this very place that Father Gury "distinguishes lies into three classes: the prejudicial lie, which he thinks wrong in proportion to the gravity of the injury it does another; the officious lie, which is venial in principle, because it does not cause grave disorder; and the pleasant lie (a joke), which of course is still more venial." But this is the language of common sense, and every man who enjoys common sense will declare that Father Gury is right here.

As the meaning of *venial sin*, however, in Catholic language, is not understood by many people, I refer to what Dr. Newman says of it in the appendix to his *Apologia*, section viii. Without quoting his words, the mere mention of his explanation suffices here. "The word venial does not mean that it is no sin at all, and that when casuists declare that an act is such, each one is at liberty to do it without minding the consequences. In the doctrine of the Church, a venial sin, unexpiated in this world, is punished in the next by the pains of purgatory, which as every one knows are not of a pleasant nature, and whose duration is not exactly known." This suffices for simple lying.

Before coming to the text of the fourth case furnished by M. Bert, it is important to call attention to the fact that for a long time the Catholics were reproached in England with the doctrine of their casuists with regard to lies, equivocation and mental reservation. We do not hear so much of it in Great Britain at this time, probably owing to the thorough ventilation of the question by Dr. Newman at the end of his *Apologia*. It is so remarkable a production, and it justifies so completely the doctrine of our casuists and of Father Gury in particular, that I would like to copy the whole



of it here. But as the works of the great Cardinal can be so easily procured, I will confine myself to a few passages only. He says, page 358 (Appleton's edition):

"Almost all authors, Catholic and Protestant, admit that *when a just cause is present*, there is some kind or other of verbal misleading which is not sin. Even silence is in certain cases virtually such a misleading, according to the proverb, 'silence gives consent.' . . . .

"Another ground of certain authors for saying that an untruth is not a lie where there is a just cause is, that veracity is a kind of justice, and, therefore, when we have no duty of justice to tell truth to another, it is no sin not to do so. Hence we may say the thing that is not to children. . . . to men who ask impertinent questions, etc. . . . .

"Another mode of verbal misleading is equivocation or a play upon words; and it is defended on the view that to lie is to use words in a sense which they will not bear. But an equivocator uses them in a received sense, though there is another received sense, and, therefore, according to this definition, he does not lie."

It would be profitless to go through all the other examples furnished by Dr. Newman. But taken in their complexity they render perfectly allowable all the decisions of Father Gury on the subject. It is, however, remarkable that among the authors, Catholic and *Protestant*, whom he quotes further on, to prove that he is correct in his statement, is found, besides several anglican divines of great repute, Milton himself, the great dissenter, who wrote among other things the following startling propositions: "Veracity is a virtue by which we speak true things to him *to whom* it is equitable, and concerning what things it is suitable for the *good of our neighbor*. . . . All dissimulation is not wrong, for it is not necessary for us always openly to bring out the truth. That only is blamed which is malicious, etc."

It is a pity I must stop here, for what follows is still more remarkable; and if Milton had lived in this age, he might have been enrolled among the disciples of F. Gury.

Let us now come to the bold *Magazine* of the Messrs. Harpers on the question of lying; and the confutation of its contributor will be the more easy that this time at least it was not difficult to find the case among those of the Jesuit author. The name even for once was not changed; so that the attack at last was open, and I had not to look for other analogous examples. I am sorry to say that in the present case M. Bert will be found either very ignorant of Latin or very unscrupulous when Jesuits only are concerned. Who knows if it is not the one as well as the other? This is his text:

"Theofried having inherited an estate, and concealed his wealth to avoid paying his creditors, replies that he has concealed nothing. At another time (2dly), he denies to the judge who interrogates him that he had restored some money he had borrowed. At another time (3dly), to the question of the customs' officers if he had any article liable to duty, he replied that he had not."

*Question.* "Is Theofried to be condemned as a liar?"

Before speaking of the *answer*, M. Bert must be told that he has either misunderstood the Latin of Gury, or purposely falsified his text. Gury says:

"Theofried having inherited an estate, and *concealed that part of his wealth from which he was NOT obliged to satisfy the claims of his creditors*, replied that he had concealed nothing." The Latin of the italicized phrase, which differs so much from the text of Paul Bert, is: *cum bona occultasset ex quibus NON tenebatur creditoribus satisfacere* (Causus Consc., T. I, p. 280, Pelagaud Edit., 1864).

This alone could allow me to stop a discussion so painful to my feelings, and I think my readers would consider me justified in doing so. But it is better to go on. The second part of the statement of the case by P. Bert can be read above. The text of Gury differs *in toto* from it, because it contains a few words more: "At another time, having borrowed money, *and having returned it*—'cum jam satisfecisset,' he denies, etc." The third and last part alone is accurate. The consideration of the *answer* is now in order. Let us see first the text of Paul Bert.

*Answer.* "Theofried has not sinned against truth in the first case, because in reality he concealed nothing in the sense of the interrogation, or in the sense in which he could be justly interrogated." This is truly the answer of Father Gury; and it is the true one considering his genuine text. But as M. Bert had falsified it, he is indignant, and adds: "It is as if he had said he had committed no injustice to his creditors." Of course he did not commit any injustice to his creditors, since, according to the true text of F. Gury, "he was *not* obliged to satisfy their claims from that part of his wealth which he concealed." This was the supposition on which the decision had to be based. But M. Bert, anxious to have the Jesuit condemned by public verdict, suppressed the supposition, and grew indignant at his decision. Is it honest?

In the second case Father Gury decides as in the first, but in his statement of the case he supposed, as was seen, that the borrower had previously returned the amount of the loan; and M. Bert suppressed again that part of the text, in order to have again occasion to accuse the Jesuit.

As to the third case, the answer of Father Gury is precisely that of Blackstone, *a renowned interpreter of law in England*, as Arch-

bishop F. P. Kenrick says in his work on Moral Theology. Blackstone writes in his celebrated *Commentary* (Introduct., sect. 2, n. 58): "In relation to those laws which enjoin only positive duties, and forbid only such things as are not *mala in se*, but *mala prohibita* merely, without any mixture of moral guilt, annexing a penalty to non-compliance, here I apprehend conscience is not farther concerned than by directing a submission to that penalty, in case of our breach of those laws." The imposition of customs' duties is certainly one of the chief enactments of such laws as these. There are, it is true, other English lawyers who are of another opinion; but at least Blackstone has never been taxed of immorality for his doctrine in this case, and Father Gury is entitled to enjoy the same exemption from blame.

Fifth case, on keeping secrets: Here M. Bert and his friend A. G. are really incomprehensible. They start from the loud accusation that "Mr. Gury shows how keeping a secret is as easy as lying." The reader will conclude that Gury's *recipe*—the word is used here—makes it easy to get rid of that obligation even when it has been secured by an oath—*juramento*. Still the Jesuit author seems to be very strict on keeping secrets. I am satisfied here with the text of the writer in *Harpers' Magazine*, and do not intend to confront it with that of the Jesuit author. Those confrontations of texts are always unpleasant and tedious to the reader. All I see in the *Magazine* convinces me that Father Gury is extremely strict on that subject, though they say that "he shows how keeping a secret is as easy as lying." He approves of the conduct of Amand, who refuses to reveal a theft of Marinus, because he had promised under oath not to speak of it to anybody. Brought before the judge he refuses still, because "a secret of this kind binds in all cases, except where the public"—Bert ought to have said with Gury, public *good*—"is interested." Can any casuist be more strict than this? Is it not incomprehensible that M. Bert accuses Father Gury of being lax on keeping a secret?

It is true, the Jesuit author says besides—of which there is not a word in the *Magazine*—that if Amand is a priest, and knows the secret through the confessional only, he cannot reveal it, even to a judge, nay, even in case the public good is interested; he would be bound to lay down his life if necessary rather than reveal it. I wonder that the accusers of Father Gury have not remarked it, and called down the public animadversion on such doctrine as this. Still it was approved by civil magistrates in the city of New York more than fifty years ago. Fathers Kohlman and Fenwick, of the Society of Jesus, were summoned to testify on a crime which they knew through the confessional; both refused, and the judge, who was then, I think, the recorder of the city, accepted their demand



to be excused, and since that time, I think, Catholic clergymen are never called to testify in criminal cases, except when their knowledge is altogether foreign to their ministerial duties.

Sixth case, on extreme necessity, as an excuse for appropriating what belongs to another: First kind of theft, which the Jesuit author freely allows, according to M. Bert.

It is not Jesuit authors only who say that in extreme necessity a man can take the property of another *to the extent of his actual need*. All Catholic theologians are unanimous on that subject; and I am sure that if Protestants had kept the practice of confession (a thing which would not have done them much harm, to say the least of it), their casuists would entirely agree with ours. In this happy country cases of extreme necessity seldom, if ever, happen. But we have among us poor people who have known it, because such cases are common in Europe. In Ireland particularly, how many have died of hunger? How many have saved their life and the lives of their family only through *stealing* a bushel or two of potatoes in a rich neighbor's field? Has not a priest a heart? And can he listen to those most harrowing tales without shedding tears, and consoling, instead of reproving, those who accuse themselves of it as if it were a sin?

Still, A. G. has thought proper to write (page 564 of the magazine): "The doctrines of Communism, which are so rife in all Catholic countries and communities, may probably trace their origin, as they unquestionably have their denominational sanction, in the Jesuits' confessional." Could the man be sincere in writing such a phrase as this? If he did not here positively tell a lie he must be very ignorant. I thought until to-day everybody knew that the doctrines of Communism have originated from two great causes, which are so visible that only a fool can be ignorant of them. First, the economical questions of capital and labor have necessarily arrayed labor against capital. Secondly, the political convulsions of the present age have given origin to many secret societies, among which the Communistic and Socialistic sects became prominent. Had the *Jesuits' confessional* any influence over these fatal causes? As *few* only of the laboring men arrayed against capital, and *none* of the Communists and Socialists make any use of the confessional, it is hard to see how "Communism has unquestionably the Jesuits' denominational sanction." One thing is certain, that whenever Communism obtains some power in any European country, the Jesuits, as well as the secular clergy, are its first victims. Does A. G. imagine that nobody in this country remembers the doings of the *Commune* in Paris in 1871? If it were necessary the Hon. Mr. Washburne, the United States Minister in France at that time, could be applied to. Yet I hear

that such stuff as this of *Harpers' Magazine* has produced some sensation among a number of unreflecting citizens.

Seventh case, on secret compensation: Here there is in the magazine such a farrago of facts disconnected from each other, that it would be extremely tedious to take them apart, as I have invariably done until this moment. It would carry me far beyond the limits assigned to me in this REVIEW, and I could not promise to give to this absurd matter such a degree of interest as would keep my readers awake. It is, therefore, preferable to take those cases *in globo*.

The question of *secret compensation* is very simple in Father Gury's book and in all Catholic authors. No candid Protestant or rationalist can object to it in its primary principles. It is only in a complicated case, as sometimes happens, that there can be any difficulty; then prudence, sagacity, chiefly common sense, must come in to bring on a decision approved by conscience. Of course, if one listens to M. Bert, those qualities can never be found in a Jesuit. Let him keep his opinion, which cannot be considered very valuable by those who have read me so far.

"Compensation," says Gury, "is of two kinds,—namely, *legal* and *extra-legal*. The first is confirmed by the civil law, and consists in extinguishing two debts of equal value by mutual consent. A. owes B. \$100 for cloth; B. owes A. \$100 for wine. They agree they are quits and owe nothing to each other."

This kind of compensation is not secret, and cannot give rise to any "case of conscience," but it is good to mention it because it renders *secret compensation* quite easy of comprehension. This last one is called by Gury "the recovery of one's property by seizing on something of equal value belonging to another." This other person is, of course, supposed to be indebted to the first in the same amount. An example will better explain this definition: A. owes B. \$100, but refuses to pay, and for some reason or other cannot be forced to pay. B. meets with an occasion of secretly coming into the possession of an object belonging to A. of exactly the same value, \$100. Can he do so?

Gury, as well as all other Catholic theologians, says he can, provided four conditions are complied with: First, that the debt of A. to B. is certain; in case of doubt the property of A. cannot be touched, because possession gives him a title in law; secondly, that it is not possible for B. to recover otherwise what is due to him by A.,—every one knows that a process at law is often closed to a poor man; thirdly, that both articles of property be of the same kind, if possible; fourthly, that means be taken in order that A. may never be obliged to reimburse B. or his heirs twice. (See *Compendium De Occulta Compensatione*.) Can there be any doubt

that if those conditions are fulfilled secret compensation is allowable? It is but the realization of this principle of right: "Every one can take what belongs to him wherever he finds it." *Res clamat domino.*

I have neither time nor inclination to examine closely the three or four cases of secret compensation quoted by M. Bert, with the supposed decision of the Jesuit author. I am sure that Father Gury decided according to the principles laid down in his *Compendium*, and no sensible man can find fault with those principles. No reliance, moreover, can be placed on the quotations of his accusers, and I have here a most striking proof of it in the case of Albert, a servant engaged by Medard, which is found at page 566 of the *Magazine*. Thus: *Question*. "Was Albert right in thus securing for himself the rate of wages allowed to other domestics? *Answer*. In justice Albert ought not to be condemned, because in the absence of an agreement he had an implied right to at least the lowest wages paid to domestics of his class."

I must give the exact *answer* of Father Gury, because, fortunately, I met with it in the volume of his *Cases of Conscience*, and the reader may see that it is *somewhat* different from the one given by M. Bert. (It is found in *Casus de Injuria et forto—Casus X, secundus, de Alberto et Medardo.*)

*Answer*. "Per se, and speaking strictly, Albert does not seem worthy of condemnation, because, in the absence of an agreement, he had at least an implied right to the lowest wages which are usually given to men of his condition. And from the case—*proinde*—this servant secures for himself only what is justly due to him. But before he did so, it would not be right to allow him to do it, on account of the great danger there is of hallucination. A servant cannot be easily permitted to form a decision in such case from his own judgment only; but in general he must consult a prudent and learned man. He must particularly consult his own conscience to know if he has been exact in his work, as he was bound—*rite*. For Innocent XI. has condemned the proposition which 'permits compensation to servants whenever they think that their work has been greater than the wages they receive.'"

The reader, by examining what part of Gury's answer M. Bert has thought proper to quote, and what large part he has left out, can easily conclude that this *gentleman* is not reliable in his quotations. I think, consequently, that for what remains of his worse than garbled account, I may be permitted not to enter into so many details, which become at last supremely tedious, and that a general survey will be considered sufficient.

Eighth case, on thefts: At page 565 of the *Magazine*, "A. G.,"



following the lead of M. Bert, pretends that the Jesuits "give a pretty liberal construction of the eighth commandment as *handed down* to us by Moses. The crime, according to them, does not consist in appropriating another's property to our own use, but in taking too much at a time, or from too poor a man."

The reader can easily perceive that in all the cases quoted by those *gentlemen*, the question is not to know if theft (whatever may be the quantity stolen), is reprehensible or not. By referring to the *Compendium* of Father Gury, it will instantly appear that he knows and respects the *seventh* commandment of Moses, as well as M. Bert. The only question discussed here, is to know when theft is a grave—*grievous*—sin, or only *venial*. Now it is very amusing to see how the Jesuit Father is accused of laxity,—I shall not speak of the most honorable and saintly name of the founder of the Redemptorists, which is here abominably mixed up in this question,—but the Jesuit Father is positively accused of laxity for deciding that a theft of six francs (say a dollar and a quarter) from a *rich* man, and twelve francs from a *prince*, constitutes a *grievous* sin; one franc—sometimes less—taken from a poor man, also is a *grievous* sin. Whatever is taken under these rates is *venial*.

But according to Catholic theology, a *grievous* or mortal sin, if unexpiated on earth, is punished in the next world by hell; a *venial* sin, by purgatory. I would like to inquire of M. Bert how many hells or purgatories he requires for the punishment of theft in his *strict* theology compared with the laxity of the Jesuits? This is too ridiculous to be discussed any further. We may consequently leave untouched the question of the thefts perpetrated by children and domestics.

I could enlarge here on this question of the confessional with regard to robbery and restitution. But there is no need of it. People, at least in this country, know that the confessional is often useful for restoring property to its rightful owner.

As to the foul accusation in which it is pretended that servants in Catholic countries are less scrupulous on this subject than in other more favored regions, and that with regard to this common evil of *Latin states*, "the confessional of the Jesuits is the school in which this form of crime is professed and licensed," I hope I am not ungentlemanly in calling it a *lie*. Foul language must be answered by the proper word, when a contemptuous silence would not suffice. Every man of sense knows that human nature is the same in all countries, Protestant or Catholic. In our days stealing often takes place in both, on so large a scale, that it is better not to speak of it. But to pretend that the confessional is a "school for thieving," is too odious a calumny to let it pass unanswered. Every one knows that confession is a restraint; it always acts

powerfully on corrupt human nature, and I am confident that many thoughtful Protestants would like to see their Protestant servants amenable to its tribunal. I have no room to say more.

Ninth and last class of miscellaneous cases :

1st. The two first quoted by M. Bert to prove that the Jesuits allow a man "to swear to a lie occasionally where it would promote his interest and convenience," I shall not discuss, because I am tired, and my readers must also be more than tired of such an unpleasant task. I must be satisfied with saying that the Jesuits fully know and admit the commandment of God which saith : "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Paul Bert will never be able to prove that they teach a contrary doctrine, which the Church would immediately condemn, and which they would not be permitted by Catholic bishops to hold forth in their theological seminaries. This general answer must do for all the twaddle of M. Bert on swearing.

2dly. Their *dealing with heretics* is not what the same M. Bert represents. The case of Leocadie, a *religieuse*, is *falsely* quoted in *Harpers' Magazine*. The decision from the Secretary of the (Roman) Inquisition contains two short answers, the second explaining the first ; and this second one is not even mentioned by M. Bert, though it is the most important. "Leocadie," the worthy secretary writes, and the Jesuit follows his prescription, "cannot go herself to bring a Protestant minister to a Protestant who is sick in her hospital, because this would be to hold communication in spirituals with heretics." But he immediately adds : "*Passive se habeat*," words which the bold accuser does not mention. The meaning of those words is simply : The sick Protestant has friends who are allowed to visit him ; let them go and fetch a Protestant minister. Sister Leocadie will hold herself *passive*. She will allow the minister to come and do what he pleases with the patient. This is more liberal than what has often been done in Protestant hospitals in New York. The regulations of those establishments were often very strict in refusing admission to Catholic clergymen when called by Catholic patients.

3dly, and finally, the case of Calpurnia is such that a Catholic alone can perfectly understand it. Charity for a Catholic embraces the next world as well as this earth. A Catholic mother can rejoice that a crippled child, whose life here below would be miserable, goes to heaven, having received baptism. Her lively faith enables her to bear the natural affliction she feels for the loss of her babe. If in the present case this *natural* affliction is not mentioned, it is only because the *supernatural* rejoicing of the mother forms precisely the difficulty which the moralist has to unravel. But who can suppose, except M. Bert and his friend,

that a Jesuit is ignorant of that same natural affliction which in his ministrations he has had as often occasions to witness as M. Bert did the writhings of dogs, rabbits, and guinea pigs in his innumerable vivisections? Let this be my last answer to the ravings of M. Bert, whom I wish never to quote any more.

In concluding, I hope I shall be allowed to say, with great moderation and justice, that *Harpers' Monthly Magazine* is not always a safe guide when the Catholic religion is concerned; that in reading it prejudices are often imbibed which a man of honor is afterward sorry to have for a moment entertained; that the undisguised hatred of so respectable a body as the Catholic Church is always one of the most dreadful banes of social life; and finally, that when this hatred is carried to the point of wishing to raise a mob against anything belonging to her, it becomes one of the greatest crimes which can be attempted against human society.

---

## AN IRISH GOVERNMENT FOR IRELAND.

THE article on "Ireland's Opportunity," in the last number of this REVIEW, has been quite extensively commented on, copied, or criticised, by the American press of all shades of opinion—political, social, and religious. It has caused an earnest discussion of an Irish question of the first importance. For this purpose it was written, for this is timely, and will be profitable.

Passing over the expressions of approval (a large majority of the whole), three classes of adverse opinion remain:

1. Those that disapproved in part, or on the ground of expediency.
2. Those that utterly disapproved and condemned.
3. Those that obviously misunderstood or misrepresented the suggestions offered.

The discussion, taken as a whole, is a splendid proof of the healthy earnestness and intelligence of Irish sentiment in America, as well as of the cordial sympathy of American sentiment with Ireland's grievances and struggles.

Not a single journal in America has taken the English side in the discussion. Every one that has spoken has supported the Irish cause, more or less modified. This is gratifying and significant.

Some of those who disagreed with the article, did so on the



ground that it was "not wise to raise a new issue till the Irish leaders were released."

There was no new issue raised, but an old and primal one of the Land League, as enunciated by Michael Davitt, was brought into strong light. The Land League was established as a direct step toward nationality, and not an indirect one. It came from the very men who claim to be pre-eminently "nationalists"—the radical revolutionary Irishmen.

The land agitation was not intended by Michael Davitt or Mr. Parnell to be a socialistic movement, ending only when the fundamental ethics relating to landed property were revolutionized in Great Britain and Ireland. Its express purpose was to abolish landlordism in Ireland, by government purchase, and to establish a peasant proprietary by repurchase at easy rates from the government. In the English House of Commons, on the 14th of March, Mr. Sexton said :

"The objects of the Land League are two : the first, to put down rack-renting, eviction, and landlord oppression. The second, to enable every tiller of the soil to become, on fair terms, the owner of his holding."

Let me here emphatically say that the original objects of the Land League, as expressed by the men now imprisoned, should be firmly and faithfully followed till those men have been released. The question of Irish nationality was part of the original Land League programme of Michael Davitt. Its discussion now should not distract but prepare popular opinion, so that when released from prison, the brave and able leaders will find a sentiment ready for immediate operation on the national line.

A misapprehension of the principles of the Land League has been caused by the assertion that the "Absolute No Rent" theory is the vital principle of the movement. This is a direct misstatement. The Manifesto of "No Rent" contained no such doctrine. Here are its words, and their plain meaning has been understood perfectly by the people of Ireland :

"The Executive of the National Land League, forced to abandon the policy of testing the Land Act, feels bound to advise the tenant-farmers of Ireland from this forth to pay no rent *until the government relinquishes the existing system of terrorism, and restores the constitutional rights of the people.*"

Since that document was published, the leaders of the League in Ireland have reiterated the temporary meaning of the "No Rent" policy. Mr. Sexton, M.P., undoubtedly one of the ablest of the leaders now at liberty, and who must have expressed Mr. Parnell's view, in a carefully prepared speech in the House of Commons last month, took special care to emphasize this meaning.

We quote from the report of his speech :

"The 'No Rent' manifesto had been completely misrepresented. The Chief Secretary had quoted from it a paragraph which was not in it. The Chief Secretary said it told the tenants to pay no rent. What it did was to tell the tenants to pay no rent until the government suspended the existing system of terrorism and restored the constitutional rights of the people (Hear, hear). The manifesto had been justified by the fact that the Land Act, after four months of trial, had proved an absolute failure, and was being openly evaded by the landlords. It was for the government to say how long the manifesto should be acted on. As soon as the government returned to constitutional government the 'No Rent' manifesto would be withdrawn."

The "Absolute No Rent" policy is a "complete misrepresentation" of the Land League, and is by the Irish leaders publicly denounced.

The purpose of my article in the last REVIEW was to call attention to the mistake of aiming the whole Irish force at the secondary target,—the land. No matter how perfect may be the success of the anti-landlord movement, it never can be an Irish ultimatum. Let the Land League reduce rents to a shilling an acre, the government question will remain unsettled. Admitting that the landlords ought to be starved out, starving them out will not solve the difficulty, nor abrogate their legal title to *some* recompense for the estates they hold.

No Irish tenant farmer with common sense hopes to get possession of his farm without paying something, some time, for it. Suppose no rents are paid till the present generation of landlords are starved into their graves. Their heirs, with the title-deeds, will come after them. If they have none, their creditors will step in as owners.

Sooner or later the farmer must pay for the land. The real object of the Land League, as established by Davitt and Parnell, was to get the land for the farmers at the lowest possible price.

There is no other way to get it, except by a successful fight with England; and in this way the price must be paid for it, in money and blood and a ravaged country.

England would prefer to see the Irish people keep their attention fixed on the land question alone. It would induce them to expend their time and energy on a difficulty that can be settled in the end without disturbing Great Britain in the least.

The thing that England really fears is the Irish knife approaching the bond of Union. This is what she will cover up and defend to the last stake. Since the Poynings Act was passed, four hundred years ago, she has had one deliberate policy for Ireland,—to destroy all hope of separate nationality, to make the country an English province, even if in doing so she made it a desert. We shall see her reason further on.

The Irish Parliament of the last century was only a concession granted in a moment of panic. It was made void at the first possible moment of safety to England.

It is pitiable to see Irishmen unable to realize that until this unnatural ligature is cut the very circulation of blood in the national life of Ireland is regulated by the English heart. The public official network of a country is its circulating system. This was clear to Michael Davitt's vision when two years and a half ago he said: "We must seize the offices."

Some others object to the Irish Parliamentary movement, on the ground that it would be better for the Irish farmers to purchase the land from the English government, and then go on with the agitation for a national Parliament. These critics surely cannot have seriously considered their proposition. If the question has eventually to come to actual purchase, as is evident, the English Parliament, composed of landlords, many of them the very landlords interested, would compel the Irish farmers to pay an exorbitant and arbitrary price for the land. What reason is there to think they would act differently? They have the power, and it would be for their interest to use it. Have the English lawmakers ever been so generous to Ireland that she may trust them with this important business?

But, it will be said, if they asked too high a price the farmers would not agree to pay it. Well, what is gained by a deadlock? Time is lost, the people are impoverished, and when the matter is eventually settled the country will have to begin a new agitation, with an old organization. Why should the national question be thus delayed, when by using double harness the Land question and the Parliamentary question will strongly help each other?

There is only one safe and equitable way to manage the sale of the land of Ireland. It must be done by valuers appointed by an Irish Parliament, representing all classes of the Irish people. England has nothing to do with it. These valuers should base their estimates on the present market value, as settled by land in America and other countries, and take into account the unjust ex-tortions from actual holders in past years. This is a purely Irish question, and if the English Parliament is allowed to have anything to do with it the Irish farmers will be the losers.

A fear exists in some minds that Ireland would give up some precious right by entering into a federal union with England—that it would forever bind her to abandon complete independence. This is absurd. Canada has a federal union with England, and surely it would be easier for Canada to declare her independence than if she were situated as Ireland is at present.

Some other critics condemn the idea of a federal union with



England, on the ground that the latter country has never kept faith; that Ireland is virtually at war with her; that it is a lowering of principle to make any terms whatever with her; that Ireland has sore reason to hate and distrust her, and ought to repudiate every connection with her as dangerous and accursed.

With this class of opponents (they are the only critics that utterly disapprove the suggestions of my article), I am inclined in a large measure to agree. They argue with passion, but with probity. But the world, more's the pity, cannot be run on such ideal principles. The ways of men and nations are full of crookedness, selfishness, and falsehood. The relations of countries are at best a compromise. The weak, even if right, are unwise to refuse every honorable means to regain strength. Federal relations with England may be unsatisfactory, but at least they will be an improvement on the present miserable and destructive no-relations.

If there be any way by which Ireland can get rid of England, without coming to terms with her, it ought to be made known by those who oppose a federal union. The only way that we can see is to fight her with arms and drive out her armies. That will be a fight of five to thirty in number, and of five to a thousand in organization, wealth, and starting position. Is Ireland ready, or likely soon to be ready for that conflict? The men who believe in fight and understand all about it, the Revolutionists, say that Ireland is not ready, and will not be until England goes to war with a strong power.

But England will not go to war, "with Ireland at her back with a knife," as Wendell Phillips says. What, then, is to be done? Wait? But it may take a generation before the chance comes; and the present generation of men in Ireland deserve our consideration even more than the generation to follow them. The earth belongs to the men who are now alive on it.

Ireland is at war with England; admitted. But those who want legislative independence only desire to get Ireland treated according to decent warfare. At present she is treated as a nation of unruly rioters and conspirators, without any rights that the English authorities are bound to recognize.

Lastly, there are those who have misunderstood or misrepresented my words, who claim that my advice was to give up the Land League altogether, to "make a new issue," to "abandon the policy laid down by the imprisoned leaders," etc.

These are unjust and untrue assumptions; such a meaning was never dreamt of, nor expressed in my article. Simply and clearly the suggestion there offered was that the present magnificent organization of the Land League be strengthened, not changed or diverted, by taking up, gradually, the original object of an Irish

government for Ireland. But, all things considered, every objection made to the article, as well as every agreement with it, must be regarded as a favorable sign for the future of Ireland. Because, in almost every case, the objections were temperately made for discussion, and they were full of honest conviction.

No country ever agreed on its internal questions. Complete agreement would not work out the best results. The wholesome state is that in which all differences, however strong, face at least one way,—toward the common enemy. It is evident that the Irish people, scattered through the nations, are year by year drawing nearer to this condition.

The question of an Irish Parliament for Ireland is now fairly before England and the world. The leading paper in Ireland, the *Dublin Freeman's Journal*, a few weeks ago said: "The question of Home Rule, a few years ago, was only the sentiment of a small class. To-day it is the idea of all Ireland."

The Land Question is undoubtedly a matter of great importance to Ireland, as to any country. But, it may be overrated; and it has been and is overrated by Irishmen in particular. An overdependence on agricultural industry is a ruinous mistake for the present and future of the country. Even if the Land question could be settled separately, there are other vital interests that can only be attended to by an Irish government.

A need, even more important to Ireland than a peasant-proprietary, is the development of manufacturing industry. No country can be prosperous or safe that has not cultivated skilled labor, so that its natural products may be manufactured into valuable articles for the markets of the world. A pound of iron dug out of the earth may be worth one cent. When refined by skilled labor, made into steel, and manufactured into useful articles, it becomes worth two or three dollars. The country that sells its raw material has one cent; the country that manufactures it has two or three hundred per cent. more profit, besides the increased comfort of the people.

Ireland has extraordinarily rich resources which await the developing hand of her own government. The settlement of the Land question, no matter how it may be done, will leave them all untouched.

In Tyrone, Waterford, Cork, Antrim, Down, and throughout Connaught, says a famous British geologist and statistician (Mr. T. F. Henderson), writing last year, "are immense stores of iron, which remain unutilized." The same writer says, that from what can now be seen, Ireland has at least 180,000,000 tons of available coal, from which she raises yearly only 130,000 tons; yet she imports over 2,000,000 tons yearly from England.

But even without coal, Ireland possesses abundance of excellent fuel in her peat. There are nearly 3,000,000 acres of bog-land in the island (2,830,000), and the average depth of peat on this enormous surface is 25 feet; in some cases it is over 40 feet.

Ireland has gold, silver, lead and copper, in districts well known to geologists. The work in any of these fields is inconsiderable, and must continue so till the national mind is aroused and instructed by intelligent and paternal care.

It will be, as it has been, the interest of England to keep Ireland in ignorance of her own wealth. There is hardly another portion of the earth, of equal size, with such a diversity of natural riches. Besides those named, there are mineral treasures of sulphur, salt, gypsum, antimony, arsenic, cobalt, magnesia, alum, and steatite. There are mineral springs in various places. There are invaluable clays for porcelain, an endless supply of lime, and a wonderful variety of marble, granite, and other building stone. The millions of acres of her surface capable of production, but now mostly laid down in grass, is unexcelled on the earth for richness and fertility.

Suppose these resources lay open to the scientific eye in the State of Massachusetts, or even in distant Colorado, how soon would the multiform skill of miner and manufacturer transform them into untold wealth and comfort for the people.

But Ireland's wealth is not in her minerals alone. She has a vast advantage in position; she has the Atlantic side of England, and her coast is quite unlike the outline of Great Britain. This is at once Ireland's advantage and the cause of her misery. England has only two or three great harbors, and these are on the dangerous English Channel; while Ireland has thirty-one harbors suitable for the largest ships and frigates, besides an immense number for coasting vessels. And with this, she has an unrivalled water-power, in her swift rivers, at present almost quite unused.

How are these possibilities to be developed? The establishment of a peasant proprietary will not solve the problem. The "abolition of the landlords," even by an infinite continuance of "no rent," will not do it. England will be glad to see Ireland spending her strength on a fight with the landlords, instead of using it to get back her government, under which she might grow rich and powerful by industrial and commercial development.

Let this be kept constantly in mind: England does not hold Ireland now merely to make money out of her. As a matter of fact, she keeps her of late years at a loss, and would keep her at a still greater one. It is not as an investment she values her, but as a security against rivalry. It is England's set purpose, because it is her interest to keep Ireland poor and undeveloped. Ireland is too



near and has too many natural advantages to be allowed to grow prosperous and independent, and perhaps dangerous.

If Ireland were ruled by her own people for the next twenty-five years she would take her place as a nation with a magnificent future. She has enough natural resources, and her people have enough intelligence to win one of the first places among the nations of the world.

England must let her have her own Parliament if the Irishmen in Ireland and America make up their minds that it shall be so. They need not appeal to her justice; it is a matter of necessity. For her own safety England must yield. The Irish have grown to be a menacing power. Their kindred in America are potent factors of public opinion. England's interests are in constant danger of collision with American interests. They will rush into each other some time. England's prosperity could be broken in a short time by an anti-English policy in the United States; and outside the Irish element her enemies in America are legion. Her foreign possessions keep her in constant danger of rupture with the great powers. With Ireland in her present temper, England cannot venture on a war with a powerful enemy. She must either satisfy Ireland or swallow a national insult, and while she stands on guard in Dublin and Cork, see her name sink and her rich foreign possessions diminish.

This year the demand for an Irish government for Ireland shall be made. It is made already, and the silent demand has been recognized by England. Words are not needed to show her the inevitable. The Irish must be satisfied, or England's future is in danger—that is clear to her.

The differences of opinion among the Irish do not give her comfort now. They are not the kind of differences she wants; quite the contrary. The least that is asked by the most conservative men is a repeal of the Union and an Irish Parliament. The Irishmen who disagree with these, propose not only complete independence, but the destruction of the whole British aristocratic fabric by a socialistic revolution, in which her own impoverished masses will be invited to participate.

There are, therefore, three horns to the English dilemma, and three immediate horns. She must sit on one, if Irishmen are not blind to their own interests. There is no other way out. Unless a mistaken policy is adopted, Ireland will have her own Parliament within two years at most, probably within one. Never since England bound her into subjection has her present opportunity been equalled. She has grown up to it. All that is needed is the national sentiment of the Irish people, expressed through their present splendid Land League organization.

The main requirement now is the central figure of a Man. That man is in prison, and this, even more than the anti-landlord policy, is the secret of his imprisonment. Gladstone knows, and England knows, that Parnell meant and means to cut the tie between the countries that is strangling Ireland.

There is one comforting thought about his imprisonment. It has separated him from all other men in the hearts of the Irish people. It has intensified and unified his power. He will not have to agitate any more; he will only need to speak. What might have taken years to do, he will be able to accomplish in a week. They imprisoned a man; when they release him they will release an Idea.

---

#### THE PRACTICE OF SHAVING IN THE LATIN CHURCH.

*Catalanus. Commentaria in Pont. Rom.*

*Christianus Lupus. Opera omnia.*

*Baronius. Annales Eccles.*

THE present discipline of the clergy of the Latin Church is opposed to the wearing of beards. An attempt to innovate in this matter was severely rebuked, and effectually checked in 1863, by the Papal Nuncio in Bavaria; and the Fathers of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore direct all the clerics under their charge to conform themselves to the discipline of the clergy of Rome, where beards are not tolerated.<sup>1</sup>

A close study of this matter will prove useful and not without interest. We need hardly say that some unfounded theories and false opinions are circulated, the origin of which is undoubtedly to be ascribed to a lack of knowledge of the ancient discipline of the Church. Of those opinions and theories we do not wish to write a direct and elaborate refutation; they must necessarily fall to the ground before an accurate statement of the practice and custom of the Latin Church with regard to the shaving of the beard. Being under the impression that every member of the American clergy will feel interested in giving this subject close and serious attention, we desire to exhibit, in its briefest form possible, the prac-

---

<sup>1</sup> Num. 151 et docum. IV. in Append. "De Barba a Clericis haud gestanda."

tice of the Latin clergy, the discipline of the Western Church, its antiquity, its origin, its mystical signification.

Let it be remembered that the wearing or shaving of beards is a matter of discipline, that, therefore, with regard to faith and morals, it is a matter of perfect indifference; with interior sanctity it has nothing to do, and our future heavenly glory will not (thank God) be dependent on the size or shape of the wool of our countenance. "Quid enim," we ask with Ratramnus, "refert ad justitiæ non tantum perfectionem, verum etiam inchoationem barbæ detonsio vel conservatio?" L. IV. *Contra Græcorum oppos.* c. 5. However, the love of the Church comprises the love of her discipline; and docile, obedient, dutiful ecclesiastics are ever ready to comply with her ordinances even in matters apparently trifling. The Holy Ghost, moreover, warns us not to despise little things: "Qui spernit modica, paulatim decidet."<sup>1</sup> "Qui fidelis est in minimo et in majori fidelis est; et qui in modico iniquus est, et in majori iniquus est."<sup>2</sup> When, furthermore, we remember that the Church of Rome is our "Mater et Magistra,"<sup>3</sup> whose name we adopt and fondly retain by calling ourselves "Roman Catholics," we must admit that there is much inconsistency in boasting of following the Church of Rome step by step, and in exhibiting in our very persons a conspicuous difference with her in a point of her discipline which is both ancient and modern.

To preclude objections that have evidently nothing to do with the matter under consideration, it is necessary to examine, in this matter, the legislation of Moses and the discipline of the Greek or Eastern Church.

I. We admit that the Jews were forbidden by the Mosaic law to shave their beards; we admit that our blessed Lord let his beard grow in accordance with this Jewish custom and in compliance with the law of Moses. Nevertheless, the discipline of the Latin Church has ever been different from that Jewish custom and from that practice of our Lord.

Let us examine the law of Leviticus concerning the beards of the Jews and inquire into its object. The Lord ordered Moses to give to the whole congregation of the children of Israel the following ordinance: "Neque in rotundum attondebitis comam: nec radetis barbam."<sup>4</sup> Moses was also ordered to say to the Priests, sons of Aaron: "Non radent caput, nec barbam, neque in carnibus suis facient incisuras."<sup>5</sup> The same precept was renewed and extended to the Levites, sons of Sadoç, by the Lord speaking to

<sup>1</sup> Eccl. i. xix. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Pius V. constit. quo primum.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. xxi. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Luc. xvi. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Levit. xix. 27.



Ezechiel as follows : " Caput autem suum non radent, neque comam nutrient : sed tondentes attendent capita sua."<sup>1</sup>

What was the object of so strange a precept, and why did God legislate on so trifling a matter ? A Lapidé will answer that question briefly : " Hæc (viz., radere caput et barbam et facere incisuras in carne) in luctu faciebant gentiles, ideoque ea vetita sunt Judais."<sup>2</sup> But when a Lapidé says in an off-hand way that the secular clergy used to wear their beards, and the monks to shave smooth; he is, as we shall see, not a little beside the mark.<sup>3</sup>

The object, then, of this divine precept, forbidding the shaving of the beard, was to remove people and priests the farthest away possible from all the practices of the priests of idols. St. Jerome bears witness to it : " Perspicue demonstratur nec rasis capitibus, sicut sacerdotes, cultoresque Isidis atque Serapidis, nos esse debere."<sup>4</sup>

What was the practice of those idolatrous priests ? In Asia the Babylonian priests shaved their heads and faces : " In domibus eorum (idolorum) sacerdotes sedent, habentes tunicas scissas, et capita et barbam rasam, quorum capita nuda sunt."<sup>5</sup> The priests of Baal, in the presence of Elias, cut their own flesh with knives : " Clamabant voce magna et incidebant se juxta ritum suum cultris et lanceolis, donec perfunderentur sanguine."<sup>6</sup> In Egypt, as Herodotus informs us (Euterpe), the same cruel practice was indulged in, and it lasted to the very time of Lactantius.<sup>7</sup> Baronius, in his ecclesiastical annals,<sup>8</sup> quotes two pagan authors, Lucian (de dea Syra) and Apuleius (de Asino Aureo), whose statements corroborate what we have said. Speaking of the antiquity of the temple of the Syrian goddess, the construction of which was ascribed to Deucalion, they inform us that " in that temple, priests, eunuchs without beards, offered sacrifice and cut their own flesh with knives, whilst that sacrifice was going on." And Lucian continues to inform us that " the people that would go to the temple of the Syrian Goddess would shave the hair of their heads, eyebrows, and beards," and concludes thus : " Certis autem notis compunguntur omnes, alii quidem in vola manus, alii autem in cervice : et inde est quod cuncti Assyrii notas inustas habent."<sup>9</sup> That practice, therefore, must have been a widespread, almost a universal one, as we find it both in Europe and Asia ; it must also have been an inveterate one, as we find it in the fourth century mentioned by Lactantius, quoted above ; and the shaving of head, eyebrows, and beards is hinted at in Martial's expressions :

<sup>1</sup> Ezech. xlv. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Id. in Levit. xix. 27.

<sup>3</sup> Baruch vi. 30.

<sup>7</sup> Instit. L. I. c. 21.

<sup>9</sup> Opud Baron. loc cit.

<sup>4</sup> A Lap. in Levit. xxi. 5.

<sup>4</sup> S. Hier. in Ezech. xlv. 20.

<sup>6</sup> III. Reg. xviii. 28.

<sup>8</sup> Ad annum 58.

“Cohors pilata”<sup>1</sup> and “Linigeri calvi”<sup>2</sup> are borne witness to by St. Ambrose: “Et cum ipsi capita et supercilia sua radant, si quando Isidis suscipiunt sacra.”<sup>3</sup>

These words of St. Ambrose are remarkable in that they pass by the shaving of beards. The reason is that St. Ambrose was speaking of prominent citizens of Rome. The latter were in the habit of shaving smooth, and had, therefore, only to shave their heads and eyebrows in order to be deemed worthy to sacrifice to Isis. It is this custom of shaving among Roman patricians that gave rise to the custom of shaving among the Roman clergy, as the Roman toga became the pattern of the Roman cassock. But we ought not to anticipate; we will see this presently. Let us now draw our conclusion.

We have conclusive evidence that the practice of worshippers of false gods, both priests and people, was to shave every hair of their bodies and to inflict deep gashes in their own flesh; we have in the Ancient Testament strict precepts forbidding Jews and their priests to shave and to cut themselves,—can there, then, be the least doubt in any one’s mind that God, in those enactments, had for object to establish a conspicuous difference between His people and the benighted worshippers of idols?

But this divine precept expired with the death of Christ and has lost its power to bind us; not only because the object of removing us from idolatry has no more any practical utility, but mainly because that precept belonged to the ceremonial part of the Mosaic law, which ceased at the coming of the Messias, as St. Thomas teaches.<sup>4</sup> There is, therefore, no greater obligation to wear beards than to be circumcised.

II. As some of the holy fathers have severe strictures against the shaving of the beard, we must say a word of the practice of the Greek or Eastern Church. There have been, from time immemorial, slight differences in matters of discipline between the Greek and the Latin portions of the Catholic Church; the former use leavened, the latter unleavened bread in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; the former never fast on Saturdays, among the latter Saturdays are not excepted from the Lenten fast; in the Greek Church the sacrament of confirmation is administered by priests, among the Latins the bishop alone administers that sacrament; the Greek clergy wear long beards, the Latin clergy shave smooth. Such and other differences, by which the doctrine of the true faith is not affected, should never have occasioned a schism between the East

<sup>1</sup> Epigram. Lib. x, 48.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. xii. 29, Cf. Forcellini Lexicon.

<sup>3</sup> S. Ambros. ad sabin., Ep. lviii.

<sup>4</sup> I, 2, qu. ciii. art. 3.

and the West. Human nature, however, is prone to evil, and man's original wickedness tears asunder the bond of peace that ought to unite us all in Christ. The foul work of sowing cockle was begun in the council "in Trullo" and consummated by Photius; and the latter, among the many accusations he brought against the Latins, made a grievous matter of their practice of shaving their beards, though he was, himself, a glabrous, smooth-faced eunuch: "Cum alioquin ipse esset eunuchus glaber."<sup>1</sup>

This charge brought against the Latin clergy is unreasonable and foolish in the extreme; but when, for reasons of vanity and worldliness, some of the Greek clergy departed from the practice of wearing long beards, a practice ancient and universal among them, there is no reason why we should be surprised at the severity of the expressions of Greek fathers. The first we meet is the author of the *Constitutiones Apostolicæ*, which constitutions, let it be said by the way, are not, at least in their present shape, the work of St. Clement: "Constitutiones quas vocant apostolicas," says Mansi,<sup>2</sup> "opus esse spurium, ab iis, quibus ascribuntur, apostolis, tum et ab ipsa apostolarum ætate penitus alienum, nemo theologus modo ignorat vel diffitetur." That work, however, is very old, and it has the following: "Oportet præterea non barbæ pilum corrumpere, nec formam hominis contra naturam mutare. 'Non enim,' inquit lex, 'depilabitis barbas vestras.' Nam decori gratia creator Deus læves mulieres fecit; id porro viris inconcinnum merito iudicavit. Tuvero, si hæc uti placeas feceris, legis violator execrabilis eris apud Deum qui te ad imaginem suam fecit."<sup>3</sup>

The "Constitutiones Apostolicæ" contain the rites and practices of the Eastern Church; no wonder, therefore, that they favor the wearing of beards. The chapter we have quoted is intituled: "De ornatu, et peccato inde proficiscente," and begins with cautioning men against the wickedness of dressing their hair with a view of favorably impressing persons of the weaker sex. The very passage adduced by us refers to that wicked intention: "Tu vero, si hæc uti placeas feceris." Let us add that in the above quotation no mention is made of clerics or monks, and we think we are justified in concluding that the subject we are treating is not affected by the passage in question.

Another writer, very severe on the custom of shaving, is Clement of Alexandria: "Est enim turpe spectaculum: barbæ ad cutem usque tonsura non videtur multum abesse a vulsione et lævore etc."<sup>4</sup> In that chapter of his *Pædagogus*, Clement gives a com-

<sup>1</sup> Baron. ad annum, 58.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. L. i. c. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Concil. I.

<sup>4</sup> Pædag. L. iii. c. II.



pendious rule of life to all Christian men and women, without making any particular allusions to the clergy.

The same remark applies to the third chapter of the same book of Clement of Alexandria, "*Pædagogus*," where he inveighs against Christian men becoming effeminate, and losing the very appearance of virility. The heading of that chapter is "*Adversus viros qui formam colunt*." The *Pædagogus*, therefore, intends to castigate men who plucked their beards for vanity sake; his remarks do not apply to priests who, for mystical reasons, comply with a custom of long standing. He writes as follows: "*Ad molitum declinantes, plane effeminantur, illiberali quidem tonsu ac meretricio se tondentes. . . . Quid de iis dixerit quispiam qui eos viderit? Certe tamquam metoposcopus (a physiognomist) ex habitu divinat esse adulteros, effeminatos, utrique Veneri deditos, pilis infestos, glabros, florem virilem abhorrentes, comas, non secus ac mulieres, ornantes.*" Then, venting his well-deserved wrath against barbers who made themselves instrumental in keeping up a fashion so objectionable, he proceeds thus: "*Eos enim, qui viri sunt, radi ac lævigari, quomodo non est degeneris? . . . Eum, qui vir est, pecti et tonderi, crines componentem ad speculum, genasque radi, velli ac deglabrari, quomodo non est plane muliebre? . . . Deus enim voluit feminam quidem esse glabram ac lævem, sola coma, sicut equum juba, sponte naturæ exultantem: virum autem cum sicut leones barba ornasset, virilem etiam fecit hirsuto pectore, quod quidem est roboris et imperii iudicium. . . . Id ergo violare quod est virilis naturæ signum, scilicet hirsutum, est impium.*" Those strictures are perfectly applicable to Christian men of the laity; but to apply them, as A Lapidè does, to a clergy who, through their vow of celibacy, place themselves above all differences of sexes, and are leading, by anticipation, the life of those that "neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels,"—that is an evident proof of lack of argument. What business has a priest to take precious care of the sign of the virile sex on his face, if he has voluntarily renounced the carnal pleasure with which that sex is connected? We could place this reason in much stronger light; but the matter is delicate, and we turn to the next holy father, St. Epiphanius.

St. Epiphanius<sup>1</sup> comes nearer to the point, inasmuch as he speaks of priests: "*Illi enim tametsi e sacerdotum numero sint.*"<sup>2</sup> He rebukes them in the following language: "*Sed deterius quiddam ac contrarium ab illis (Massalianis) geritur: siquidem isti barbam, id est, propriam viri formam, resecant; capillos vero ut plurimum prolixiores habent. Atqui quod ad barbam attinet, in Apostolorum Constitutionibus divino sermone ac dogmate præscribitur ne ea*

<sup>1</sup> Hæc. 80, n. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. n. 6.

corrumpatur." The "corrumpatur" is the expression of the LXX., where, in the Latin Vulgate, we have "radetis." St. Epiphanius quotes, as we see, the Apostolical Constitutions. If we admit, with Tillemont, that the Doctrines of the Apostles, quoted by St. Athanasius and Eusebius, are different from these Constitutions, we must infer that St. Epiphanius was the first who quoted the latter; from which many draw the inference that those "Constitutiones" were written only a little before the time of St. Epiphanius. The argument, then, he makes use of against the Massalians, is not very convincing, not only because the defence to shave did not originate with the Apostles, those Constitutions not being the latter's work, but also because the ceremonial part of the Divine Law, where that defence is contained, was abrogated with the spread of Christianity. We dismiss this part of our subject, on which we have dwelt already too long, with one remark. If fathers of the Greek or Eastern Church are using strong language in condemnation of the custom of shaving, we must bear in mind that they speak for the clergy of the Eastern Church, and we would be wrong in construing their words so as to imply a censure of the practice of the Latin clergy. Those same fathers sat in œcumenical councils with Latin fathers; they saw the smooth-shaved faces of the latter, and never quarrelled about a matter so trivial; to Photius, the ambitious hypocrite, the author of the "Greek Schism," was reserved the odium of tearing asunder, for that trifling reason, the tunic of Christ. We will treat what we have to say of beards, with regard to the Latin clergy, under the following heads:

1. The origin of the practice of shaving.
2. The antiquity and universality of that practice in Europe.
3. Its mystical signification.

#### I. ITS ORIGIN.

We write without prejudice; we are not haters of beards, and we repudiate the term of "misopogon" used by A Lapide; we are lovers of ecclesiastical discipline, and it is as such that we venture to come forward on ground seldom trodden before. Our ecclesiastical and liturgical practices have, for the most part, two original causes: one may be called "historical," the other "religious." The light, for instance, we use in our churches, has for religious cause the chandelier with seven branches in the Ancient Temple; its historical origin may be traced to the darkness of the Catacombs, where lamps were an indispensable requisite. We will begin with the "historical" origin of the custom of shaving among the Latin clergy.

I. The following practical rule, with which the Church generally complies, shows her superior wisdom. When working at the

conversion of a nation, her first missionaries adopt the customs, the dress, the external appearance of that nation, in order to remove all the prejudice people naturally have against foreigners; but when the conversion of that nation is an accomplished fact, the Church is jealously careful to establish a conspicuous difference in dress and external appearance between the laity and the clergy, in order to remind the latter of the sanctity of their calling, and the purity of life that calling requires. In compliance with that rule, Albanian priests wear a light mustache, Chinese priests shave their heads, the apostles of the Jews and of Greek nations did wear long beards, and the clergy of Rome did shave smooth, *because the Romans were accustomed to that practice*. This statement ought to be well demonstrated.

We do not mean to say that ever since the foundation of Rome, patricians kept up the custom of shaving their beards, for every reader of Roman history remembers the Roman senators, who, at the time of the first invasion of the Gauls, remained seated on their curule chairs in the forum, and relied on the impression that the sight of their imposing beards would produce on the victors. Ovid calls the ancient Romans his "unshaved ancestors."

"Denique quodcumque est, quo corpora nostra piantur,  
Hoc habet intonsos nomen habebat avos." <sup>1</sup>

Scipio, the African, is said to have been the first Roman who took to the use of razors; and Ticinius, a Sicilian, is supposed to have introduced that custom into Rome from his country.<sup>2</sup> Be that as it may, certain it is that, at the time of the preaching of the Christian doctrine, the Roman emperors, and Roman citizens generally, were in the habit of shaving their beards, and the Roman clergy followed that practice. We are aware that a certain way of plucking out one's beard, so as to have a glossy, womanlike appearance, is found fault with in Julius Cæsar and Emperor Otho by Suetonius, and in the early Christians by Tertullian and St. Cyprian: "Cæterum et viris propter feminas et feminis propter viros, vitio naturæ ingenita est placendi voluntas, propriasque præstigias formæ et hic sexus sibi agnoscit, *barbam acrius cædere*, intervellere, circumradere, capillum disponere . . . omnia illa ut otiosa, ut hostilia pudicitiae recusantur."<sup>3</sup> The "*corrupta barba in viris*"<sup>4</sup> of St. Cyprian, his words, "*cumque scriptum sit, 'non corrumpetis effigiem barbæ vestræ,' barbam vellit et faciem suam comit* (sc. peccator qui lavacra cum feminis quotidie cebbret),"<sup>5</sup> and his second quotation of the above text of Leviticus under the heading "*Non vellendum*,"<sup>6</sup> have an evident reference to the same practice of plucking out one's beard altogether with effeminate intentions.

<sup>1</sup> L. ii. Fastorum.

<sup>3</sup> Tertull. ii. De Cultu Femin., c. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., c. 30.

<sup>2</sup> Plin. L. vii. c. 59.

<sup>4</sup> S. Cypr. De Lapsis., c. 6.

<sup>6</sup> Id. Lib. iii. Testim., c. 84.



The better to understand those and similar passages of ancient fathers, such as "Placebit et ille qui vultus suos novacula mutat? Infidelis erga faciem suam quam non contentus Saturno et Isidi et Libero proximam facere, etc.;"<sup>1</sup> and "cutem fingere, collum demulcere,"<sup>2</sup>—we must bear in mind that some of the ancient Romans used a surgical instrument, a kind of pincers, called "volsella" and "vulsella," to pull out the hair of their beards with its root, so as to prevent it from growing again. Forcellini defines the "volsella," "instrumentum pilis e corpore radicitus *evellendis* idoneum;" and Martial<sup>3</sup> refers to that practice: "Purgentque sævæ cana labra volsellæ."

Leaving that objectionable practice out of the question, we say, with Baronius, that the habitual shaving of the beard was a Roman custom, and that, consequently, the Roman clergy adopted it. "Barbæ illa abrasio, quæ more majorum absque fuco, arteve simpliciter facta esset, æque communis Romanis omnibus erat. . . . Christiani Romæ agentes cur non sicut ceteri, abrasa incederent barba, cum honestus, spectatusque haberetur ejusmodi communis omnium cultus, nec aliqua vel levis saltem esset ejus observationis superstitio?"<sup>4</sup> Gellius,<sup>5</sup> quoted by Baronius, informs us that the practice of shaving was, in the Romans, a mark of nobility, giving us to understand that slaves only wore beards: "In Occidente, atque potissimum Romæ, qui præsertim maturioris ætatis erant, tanquam quoddam nobilitatis insigne, radere barbam consueverant."<sup>6</sup> Even some Greeks in the East are reported by Dio Chrysostomus to have followed that Roman custom: "Quinetiam inter Græcos nonnullos in suis ipsorum regionibus, quo se Romanorum studiosos esse signo aliquo præ se ferrent, testatur Dio<sup>7</sup> consuevisse contra Græcorum omnium suorumque gentilium consuetudinem, barba rasos incedere *more Romanorum*."<sup>8</sup> This custom of shaving was still in vogue at the time of the invasion of the Goths; we have a proof of it in the sarcastic epigrams of Ennodius, who became Bishop of Pavia, against a certain Jovinian, who, wearing a beard like a Barbarian, wore a cloak, "lacerna," like a Roman.

"De Joviniano, qui cum haberet barbam Gothicam Lacerna vestitus processit. Ex tempore.

1. Barbaricam faciem Rómanos sumere cultus  
Miror, et in modico distinctas corpore gentes.

ALITER.

2. Ronfuleam tegetem nox oris nubila fuscet:  
Oppressit vestes tenebroso tegmine vultus.

<sup>1</sup> Tert. De Spect., c. 23.

<sup>3</sup> Epigr. L. ix. 28.

<sup>5</sup> Lib. iii. c. 4.

<sup>7</sup> Orat. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Id. De Pallio., c. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Baron, am, 58.

<sup>6</sup> Apud Bar. l. c.

<sup>8</sup> Bar. l. c.

ALITER.

3. Nobilibus tollis genium, male compte, lacernis,  
Discordes miscens inimico fœdere proles,"<sup>1</sup>

The influx of the Barbarians must have put an end to that custom, but it was kept up by the Roman emperors and by the clergy.

There are still extant numerous ancient medals and pieces of coin with the true effigy of the emperors that struck them; the latter are represented without beard. Adrian was the first Roman emperor who wore beard. "Notatus est a Dione<sup>2</sup> et aliis Hadrianus, qui primus omnium barbatus incessit, vel alii post eum, sed non sic tamen ut ceteri Romanorum ipsos imitarentur."<sup>3</sup>

The Roman emperors that withdrew from Romè and resided in Constantinople continued the Roman practice of shaving; a bust of Constantine I., preserved to our time, represents that emperor with a smooth-shaved countenance. Julian, the apostate, who affected the appearance of a philosopher, and wore a long beard after the philosophers' fashion, became the object of the sarcasm of the Christians of Antioch; they derided the novelty of a bearded emperor: "Insuetam Imperatori formam in ipso riserunt."<sup>4</sup> Julian retorted by writing his "Misopogon," where he says: "Ne quisquam existimet me ex maledicto isto gravius commoveri. Ipse enim causam prætereo, qui hircorum simile mentum gero, cum possim hoc læve, glabrumque efficere."<sup>5</sup> His successors did not imitate his example; Justinian shaved his beard: "Justinianus erat mento rasus, ritu Romanorum."<sup>6</sup> Notice the expression, "ritu Romanorum," which proves that the shaving of the beard was a Roman custom. Heraclius shaved when ascending the imperial throne: "Heraclius barba fuit lata atque proluxa, sed Imperator factus extemplo comam totondit ac mentum rasi, qui est Imperatorum habitus."<sup>7</sup> Observe the words, "qui est Imperatorum habitus," an evident proof of the custom of emperors to shave smooth. Constantine IV. changed that custom, and was hence called "Pogonatus," the bearded.

Beards were so scarce in Rome that the wandering philosophers, at the time of Horace, who displayed their love of wisdom by the length of their beards, were exposed to being plucked by their whiskers by the boys on the streets:

"Vellunt tibi barbam  
Lascivi pueri."<sup>8</sup>

That custom of ancient philosophers is pleasantly referred to by Horace,<sup>9</sup> when he says: "*Sapientem* pascere barbam," and when

<sup>1</sup> Ennod. Ticin. Epigr. 57, 58, 59.

<sup>2</sup> Dio in Hadr.

<sup>3</sup> Bar. l. c.

<sup>4</sup> Christ. Lupus. De S. Leonis Actis., c. xv.

<sup>5</sup> Jul. apud eundem.

<sup>6</sup> Fasti Alexandr. apud eundem.

<sup>7</sup> Georg. Cedr. histor. comp. anno mundi 603.

<sup>8</sup> Horat. L. i., sat. 3.

<sup>9</sup> L. ii., sat. 3.

he begs all the gods and goddesses to send a barber to Damassippus :

"Di te, Damasippe, Deæque  
Verum ob consilium donent tonsore !"

But we must refrain from quoting St. John Chrysostom and Theodoretus on "philosophic" beards, for fear of tiring the patience of our readers by excessive long-windedness, and we sum up what we have said of the historical origin of the practice of shaving of the Roman clergy. The Romans, at least since the time of Scipio the African were accustomed to shave ; the Roman emperors followed the same practice. Beards were an unusual thing among the Romans, with the exception of philosophers ; it is, therefore, more than likely that the early Roman Christians complied with that national custom, and it is a remarkable fact that while Christians, at the time of Tertullian, were derided for wearing the "pallium," and giving up the "toga," a charge against which he wrote his most sarcastic book, "De Pallio," they were never taken to task for wearing beards,—a proof that they made no exception to the general custom of shaving. All foreigners were called by the Romans "Barbari." This word comes from "Barba" et "rus," because barbarians wore beards and lived in villages.<sup>1</sup> We conclude with the words of Baronius:<sup>2</sup> "Sic igitur Clementem, sic Pudentem Senatorii ordinis homines, sic denique sive Romanos, sive ceteros Romæ agentes, exceptis Orientalibus, attonsos barba fuisse, nulla dubitatio esse debet." And yet, after saying so, the learned cardinal allows his editor to print an engraving representing St. Clement with a large beard. So true it is that

"Pictoribus atque Poetis  
Quidlibet audendi semper fuit æqua potestas !"

We may, however, add that it is not admitted by all that St. Clement was a Roman citizen ; the appellation of citizen, "politou," πολιτου, which is added to his name in the title of the "Constitutiones Apostolicæ," being surmised by some to be the name of St. Hippolyte, who is supposed to have published and enlarged those Apostolical Constitutions. But let us proceed with our subject and speak of the *religious* origin of the custom of shaving among the Latin clergy.

II. We must here premise a remark which throws a considerable amount of light on the subject we are treating, and which will be made evident by the quotations to be adduced : the shaving of the beard was considered as *part and parcel of the ecclesiastical tonsure*, so that the tonsure consisted in the shaving of the beard and the

<sup>1</sup> Cassiodor in Ps. In Exitu.

<sup>2</sup> l. c.



shaving of part of the head in the shape of a crown, hence the name "corona." To prove this briefly, we will call attention to the constant practice of joining together the shaving of the crown and the shaving of the beard when speaking of ecclesiastical tonsure; and a canon of the Council of Bourges, to be quoted below, says explicitly: "Tonsuram ecclesiasticam habeant, hoc EST, barbam rasam et capite in capite."

St. Peter, being a native of Palestine and originally an Israelite, wore a long beard; but the heathens shaved both his head and beard, and from that time the ecclesiastical tonsure came into existence: "Petrus a Paganis captus et ad ludibrium Christianorum barba rarus et capite decalvatus et in gyrum attonsus; hoc deinceps ipse in mysterio in ecclesia fieri instituit," so says the anonymous author of a very ancient Chronology, quoted by Christianus Lupus.<sup>1</sup> Is this an historical fact or a legendary tradition which may be either piously believed or discarded without harm? We shall not decide; but we could adduce such weight of testimony as would force the scales down in favor of the former alternative.

The most ancient testimony is that of St. Gregory of Tours: "Petrus Apostolus ob humilitatem docendam caput desuper tonderi instituit."<sup>2</sup> This passage of St. Gregory does not, it is true, mention the shaving of the beard; it is none the less remarkable, as it derives the origin of the tonsure from St. Peter; the tonsure including, as we have said, the shaving of the beard. However, for briefness sake, and in order to steer clear of the controversy as to the time when the tonsure was first generally adopted,<sup>3</sup> we will refrain from quotations that do not express explicitly the shaving of the beard. The venerable Bede mentions a vision and a miraculous cure with which a boy of great virtue and piety was favored; in his vision the latter saw the apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, the former *was shaved like a cleric*, the latter had a flowing beard; this evidently points to the absence of beard as part of the clerical tonsure. "Præclari omnino habitus et vultus erant, lætissimi ac pulcherrimi, quales numquam ante videram. Unus quidem attonsus erat ut clericus, alius barbam habebat prolixam; dicebantque quod unus eorum Petrus, alius vocaretur Paulus."<sup>4</sup>

We will give afterwards the words of Ratramnus; a similar fact, related by St. Peter Damian, will close this chapter: "Quod mihi a senioribus intimatum est, refero: In Babylonix partibus possessionem sedes apostolica habebat, unde tantum balsami reditum per annos singulos capiebat, quod indeficienti fomite sufficeret

<sup>1</sup> De Oct. Syn. Gen., c. v.

<sup>2</sup> De Gloria Mart., Lib. i. c. 28.

<sup>3</sup> Thomassin and Hallier assign the sixth century, but are refuted by Martene and Catalanus.

<sup>4</sup> Hist. Eccles., L. iv. c. 14.

lampadi, quæ videlicet ante altare Beati Apostolorum Principis rutilabat appensa. Quam possessionem accepta pecunia papa distraxit, canonemque aromatis quem recipere solebat amisit. Aliquanto post, cum idem papa prædicto sacro-sancto altari, quasi devotus assisteret et oraret, ecce quidam terribilis et grandævus senex, *in cujus etiam facie barbirasium videbatur*, et ait. 'Tu extinxisti lucernam meam ante me et ego extinguiam lucernam tuam ante Deum : ' moxque disparuit. Ille vero protinus corrui, et paulo post diem clausit extremum."<sup>1</sup> Behold, it is by his smooth-shaved face that St. Peter is known.

Below, in a letter of Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, will be found additional proof of this tradition.

## 2. ANTIQUITY AND UNIVERSALITY.

By pointing out both the historical and the ecclesiastical origin of the Latin clergy's custom of shaving off their beard, we have given indirect proof of the antiquity of that custom ; we desire now to give additional and more conclusive proof to demonstrate that that custom is as ancient as the Church of Christ ; and this we will do by showing, at the same time, that the same custom was universal and perpetual in the Latin or Western portion of the Church. But, in order not to be misunderstood, we beg to state that we speak of a "rule" of discipline, to which, we admit, there were occasional and rare exceptions. Those exceptions are : 1st. When, during the invasion of the Barbarians, the Roman element disappeared in some countries which were then filled and settled by foreign nations all wearing beards, "Barbari," the clergy, for a time, followed their example, but came back, after a while, to the time-honored practice of shaving. Such is, we believe, the true explanation of a celebrated canon of Carthage and of another of Barcelona. 2d. It happened, now and then, that bishops and priests, mixed up with worldly people, abandoned the clerical mode of life and wore their beards long, as it was the fashion at the royal court and in the world generally ; such was to a certain extent the motive of that archbishop to whom St. Gregory VII. administered a severe rebuke. 3d. There were in Europe, in Rome even among the Popes, Oriental or Eastern Christians, as Baronius intimates in the passage above quoted ; yes, many Popes in the beginning of the Church belonged to that class of Christians that had been converted from Judaism. It is probable that many, nearly all of these wore their beards after the Oriental fashion. 4th. Julius II. was the first Pope who wore beard ; the medals, struck at the beginning of his pontificate, representing him as being yet without beard ; he let his beard grow to inspire greater respect, says

<sup>1</sup> Lib. i., Epist. 20.

Sponde.<sup>1</sup> His successors, Leo XI. and Adrian VI., did not follow his example, but continued the ancient custom of the Popes of shaving. The following Popes, until Clement XI., had some beard. Clement XI. shaved, and so did all his successors to this very day. The example of Julius II., and of twenty-four among his successors, were the cause that a great number of the clergy of the 16th and 17th centuries wore large beards, or only whiskers, or only mustaches. So much so, that Gavantus, in the form he gives for the "Scrutinium" during diocesan synods, places the following question: "An calceos, birretum, annulos, capillos, *barbam* habeant, quæ clericum decent?"<sup>2</sup> This gives us the reason why St. Francis de Sales and Mons. Olier did not shave. St. Charles Borromeo, in the beginning of his episcopate, wore beard; afterwards he gave the example of shaving to his clergy, and gave them strict orders, to which we shall have to refer again.

I. Such being the exceptions, let us prove the rule. We will begin with the words of St. Gregory VII., because they clearly establish the antiquity of the practice of shaving, and enjoin that practice as an ecclesiastical law: "Nolumus autem prudentiam tuam moleste accipere quod archiepiscopum vestrum Jacobum consuetudini Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, matris omnium Ecclesiarum, vestræque specialiter, obedire coegimus, scilicet ut, quemadmodum *totius occidentalis Ecclesiæ clerus*, ab *ipsis fidei Christianæ primordiis*, *barbam* radendi morem tenuit, ita et ipse frater noster, vester archiepiscopus raderet. Unde eminentiæ quoque tuæ præcipimus ut ipsum, ceu pastorem et spiritualem patrem, suscipiens et auscultans, cum consilio ejus omnem tuæ potestatis clerum barbas radere facias atque compellas; res quoque omnino renuentium, nisi demum consenserint, publices, id est, juri Calaritanæ Ecclesiæ tradas."<sup>3</sup>

After language so clear, so explicit and strong, will there be room for any doubt as to the prevalence of the custom of shaving in the Latin church? And yet, as the author of "Acta S. Gregorii VII." informs us (Migne Patrol Lat., Tom. 148, col. 22), there is a carved statue of that Holy Pontiff in Salerne, representing him with beard, and there are paintings in Rome from which one would infer that, during the age of St. Gregory, it was not the custom of the Latin clergy to shave. So much so, that this author expresses the belief that the wearing of beards was a general practice during that epoch. We do not know whether, when he expressed himself thus, he had present to his mind the words of St. Gregory VII. quoted just now: "Quemadmodum totius occi-

<sup>1</sup> Apud Catal. De Barba tond.

<sup>2</sup> Praxis Dioec. Syn. Parte IV., cap. 4, Form 6.

<sup>3</sup> L. viii., Epist. x. Ad. orzocum Judicem Calarit.



dentalis Ecclesiæ clerus ab ipsis fidei Christianæ primordiis, barbam radendi morem tenuit." There is certainly but one way to get at the truth in this matter, and it is by taking no notice of the work of painters, engravers, and sculptors, with the exception of contemporaneous medals and authentic portraits. Surely he was not a gifted genius, the man who is responsible for the ridiculous pictures of some editions of the Roman Pontifical, where the bishop, during the performance of the same ceremony, is represented now shaved smooth and then with a huge beard, and where the clergy are seen to stand with their backs to the altar, talking, laughing in a most unbecoming manner. There may, perhaps, not be much harm in tolerating the fiction and extravagant notions of artists; but what is intolerable is the credulity of those who believe them. To destroy the impression that might be made by the mention of a statue representing St. Gregory VII. with beard, we will add that the above-quoted author of the "*Acta S. Gregorii VII.*" mentions another image of the same Roman Pontiff on which his countenance is without beard.

We shall lay no stress on the 44th canon of the 4th Council of Carthage, because there are two contrary readings of that canon, which has given rise to much discussion. As we have it now in the *Corpus Juris Canonici*, it reads thus: "*Clericus neque comam nutriat neque barbam.*"<sup>1</sup> The other reading is: "*Clericus neque comam nutriat neque barbam radat;*" which is quite different. The leaving out of the word *radat* gave occasion to the following pleasant pun of A Lapide: "*Perperam ergo aliquis misopogon, ut barbam sacerdotibus eraderet, to radat erasit, uti erasum est in decreto Burchardi.*" Neither shall we insist on the letter of Alexander III. to the Archbishop of Canterbury, where he says: "*Clerici qui comam nutriunt et barbam, etiam inviti a suis archidiaconis tondeantur.*"<sup>2</sup> The words "*et barbam*" are not in the manuscript. However, both these canons are laws of the Church, binding on the clergy in the shape in which they were incorporated into the "*Corpus Juris.*"

This may be the place to quote the text of the third canon of the 1st Council of Barcelona, of which we have given an explanation above in the third among the exceptions to the general rule. "*Ut nullus clericorum comam nutriat aut barbam radat.*" This canon was made for Spain at the time that Spain was overrun by Visigoths and other Barbarians wearing long beards, whom it was the clergy's primary duty to convert and to christianize; no wonder that bishops ordered their clergy to adopt, as far as possible, their way of living. But, before that time, the Spanish clergy did not shave, as we learn from a concise expression of St. Paulinus,

<sup>1</sup> Can. clericus 5. De vita et honest cler.

<sup>2</sup> Can. Clerici 7, ubi supra.

Bishop of Nola: "Casta informitate capillum ad cutem cæsi, et inæqualiter semitonsi, et destituta fronte prærasi,"<sup>1</sup> says he of his clergy. Let us bear in mind that St. Paulinus belongs to the 5th century and was contemporaneous with St. Augustine.

St. Jerome, who belongs to the same century, hurls the following sarcastic prophecy at the head of Jovinian, who had left his monastery, and is supposed by Christianus Lupus to have continued to belong to the clergy: "Velis, nolis, quamquam, *barbam raseris inter (barbatos), hircos (in die judicii) numeraberis.*" He shaved before making his appearance among the clergy.

Giving to Vectius a most minute description of Germanicus, a holy priest of the church of Cantilla, in Aquitania, Sidonius Apollinaris, among other details, has the following: "Vestis astricta, tensus cothurnus, crinis in rotæ specimen accisus, *barba intra rugarum latebras mersis ad cutem secta forcipibus*,"<sup>2</sup>—a close cutting tantamount to a close shaving. We are aware that Sidonius Apollinaris, speaking of a saintly bishop, describes him with "coma brevi, barba prolixa." But he adds that the people had just then, by a holy violence, forced him to be ordained: "dixerunt, nuper impacto sacerdotio fungi."<sup>3</sup> A Lapidè, therefore, does not act judiciously when quoting Sidonius Apollinaris in favor of beards;<sup>4</sup> and Sirmondus (be it said with all respect to his learning) is rather hasty in inferring from that passage that such was the custom of the clergy of Gaul and of the whole Western Church,<sup>5</sup> in Sidonius's time. There is too much proof to the contrary to warrant such a broad conclusion. We will find that very proof in Sidonius Apollinaris himself. In his letter to Petreius he gives a most elaborate encomium of the latter's uncle, the priest of Vienna, Claudianus, and sends his epitaph in elegant Latin verses. Although, says he of Claudianus, he had neither *the beard* nor the cloak of philosophers, he did not differ from Plato's school but by faith and holy life: "Licet crinem barbamque non pasceret."<sup>6</sup> We must add that Sidonius Apollinaris also belongs to the fifth century.

The invectives of St. Jerome and St. Augustine against monks with long beards<sup>7</sup> we will pass by as foreign to this part of our subject. But we find in St. Gregory of Tours, who lived one century later than those holy men, a proof that the Bishops of Gaul shaved in his time; a part of the penance enjoined on Ursicinus, Bishop of Cahors, was to abstain from cutting both his hair and his beard: "Ursicinus Cadurcensis episcopus excommunicatur pro eo

<sup>1</sup> Epist. 22 ad Severum, alias 7.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., Ep. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Not. ad h. l. Sid. Apoll.

<sup>4</sup> Hircorum barba. S. Hier. ad Eustoch.

<sup>5</sup> Lib. iv., Ep. 13.

<sup>6</sup> L. cit.

<sup>7</sup> L. iv., Ep. 11.

quod Gundovaldum excepiſſe publice eſt confeſſus; accepto hujusmodi placito, ut pœnitentiam tribus annis agens, neque capillum *neque barbam tonderet*, vino et carnibus abſtineret, etc."<sup>1</sup>

St. Lupus, Archbiſhop of Sens, was called back from exile by Clotaire; when the king ſaw him with long hair and long beard, "caput intonſum, barbamque minime raſam, ob cumulandum abſtinentiæ rigorem," he was moved with compaſſion and gave orders to have him ſhaved: "jubet eum honorifice tractari, comamque et *barbam tonderi*."<sup>2</sup>

Thomassin quotes a paſſage from the life of St. Corbinian, Biſhop of Freisingen, where it is ſaid that, *according to his cuſtom*, he had his face waſhed and ſhaved on the day of his death: "*Ex more abluens corpus, capillos ſibi tonderi fecit et barbam radi*."<sup>3</sup>

Christianus Lupus mentions the remark of the Bertinian Annals of the Franks about a deacon, Dodo, that "as ſoon as he had joined the ſynagogue of the Jews he let his beard grow."<sup>4</sup> And St. Columbanus, the well-known Iriſh abbot, among the puniſhments he inflicts on his monks, orders ſix laſhes to be adminiſtered to the deacon whoſe beard is not ſhaved: "Sacerdos offerens qui ungulas non dempſerit, et diaconus cui barba tonſa non fuerit, ſex percuſſionibus (emendari ſtatuitur)."<sup>5</sup>

We think we have furniſhed evidence enough to prove the univerſality of ſhaving among the Latin clergy in thoſe centuries of transition between the Roman Empire and the Middle Ages, and we will, before commencing another order of arguments, add a few words of explanation of which the portrait of St. Gregory I. appears to be in need.

II. We owe to John the Deacon, a monk of Monte Caſſino, a pen-drawing of the perſonal appearance of that great Pontiff. This "Joannes Diaconus" lived more than 250 years after St. Gregory I.; his deſcription, therefore, was not made from the perſon of that Pope, but from a moſaic preſerved in a certain monaſtery, which is ſuppoſed to have exiſted in Rome. He firſt deſcribes a painting on which are repreſented St. Peter and Gordian, St. Gregory's father. The latter is depicted as follows: "Cujus Gordiani habitus caſtanei coloris planeta eſt, ſub planeta dalmatica, in pedibus caligas habens: ſtatura longa, facies deducta, *barba modica*, capilli condendi, etc." Then, after deſcribing a ſecond painting repreſenting the likeneſs of Silvia, St. Gregory's mother, Joannes Diaconus begins his deſcription of the great Pope in the following manner:

<sup>1</sup> Hiſt. Franc., L. viii. c. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Bar. ad ann., 631.

<sup>3</sup> Diſcipl. Eccles., P. I., Lib. ii. c. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Annal. Bert. Franc. ad ann. 539, apud Chriſt. Lup. De Oct. Syn. l. c.

<sup>5</sup> Reg. S. Columb., c. 10.



"Statura justa et bene formata, facie de paterna faciei longitudine et maternæ rotunditate ita medie temperata, ut cum rotunditate quadam decentissime videatur esse deducta, *barba paterno more subfulva et modica*."<sup>1</sup> We first observe that St. Gregory I., in wearing his beard, seems to have intended to follow his father's example "paterno more." For what reason? This, we confess, is a hard question to solve. We observe in the second place that his beard was cut short, "modica." But, when we turn to the pictures of St. Gregory that purpose to give his true likeness, we find that his lips and chin are shaved smooth, and that he wears short whiskers and a short beard under his chin, perhaps (as he is known to have been of very delicate health) as a protection of his throat against a malady to which public speakers are not seldom subject. This portrait, therefore, of St. Gregory I. is of no weight against the thesis we have undertaken to demonstrate; and the same manner of shaving the lower part of the face and of allowing some beard to grow under the chin may be noticed on the portraits of other Popes before Julius II:

III. We call attention to the following arguments, which we consider to be proof against any attempt at refutation, viz.: the charge of shaving, brought time and again by the Greeks against the Latin clergy, a charge admitted by the latter, never denied and always accounted for.

Photius, as we have seen, was the first who was silly enough to make of this slight matter of discipline an apple of discord between the East and the West. "Inter calumnias Photii in Romanam ac omnem Latinam Ecclesiam est illa profecto, quod nos Latini barbas radamus."<sup>2</sup>

The same charge was made by Michael Cœrularius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in the eleventh century, in his famous "Edictum Synodale," where he says of the Latins: "Neque Scripturæ animum advertere volentes, quæ 'ne deglabretis,' ait, 'menta vestra;' neque omnino animo volvere volentes, decorum id mulieribus creatorem Deum statuisse, quod indecorum esset viris."<sup>3</sup> It is, as we see, always the silly repetition of one of those ceremonial precepts that ceased to oblige long ago. That edict comprises the decree published against the Greek Schismatics by Humbertus, Cardinal Legate of St. Leo IX., in which the latter are accused of excommunicating clerics who shave their beards according to the custom of the Church of Rome: "Comam capitis et barbam, veluti Nazareni nutrientes, eos qui comas tondent, *et secundum institutionem Romanæ Ecclesiæ barbas radunt*, in communionem non re-

<sup>1</sup> Joan. Dial. Vita S. Greg., L. iv., c. 83, 84.

<sup>2</sup> Catalan in Pontif. Rom., Part. iii., tit. 29.

<sup>3</sup> Migne. Patr. Gr., T. 120, col. 738.

ciunt.”<sup>1</sup> In his letter to Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, the same Michael Cœrularius not only reiterates that foolish charge, but, what is astonishing, gives it as one of the practices in which we imitate the Jews. How soon did that Patriarch forget that he had quoted, in defence of his beard, a Jewish practice and a precept of the Mosaic law. “Et quidem,” says he, “quæ apud Judæos imitari peragunt (Latini) ista sunt: suffocata manducare, *radi*, Sab-bata servare, etc.”<sup>2</sup> For this he received from Peter, the Patriarch to whom he had written, the following rebuke: “Porro quæ cumque a te enumeratæ sunt Latinorum vitia ac errata percurramus. Et alia quidem eorum visa sunt detestanda atque fugienda, alia vero sanabilia, quædam denique digna quæ dissimulentur. Quid enim ad nos, si pontifices barbam radant? Nos quoque supra caput Gararam (tonsuram) facimus, in honorem omnino summi inter apostolos Petri, super quem magna Dei Ecclesia ædificata est (a splendid tribute to the Primacy of Peter). Quod enim in sancti contumeliam impii adinvenierunt, id nos pietate ducti in ejus gloriam honoremque vertimus: *Latini quidem barbam radentes*, nos vero in capitis vertice conficientes coronam.”<sup>3</sup> These words are remarkable, not only because they afford conspicuous proof of the general custom of shaving among the Latins, but also because they trace the origin of that custom to St. Peter himself.

When the Crusaders had seized Constantinople and proclaimed Baldwin, Earl of Flanders, Emperor of the East, a Latin Patriarch was appointed by the Pope to attend to the Latin Christians; as that Patriarch shaved smooth, a holy horror seized upon the Greek historian, Nicetas Choniates, who exclaimed that “that was the abomination of desolation predicted by Daniel the Prophet.”<sup>4</sup>

Georgius Phrantze, in his “Chronicon Majus,”<sup>5</sup> is another witness, whose words are brief but convincing: “Illo tempore imperatoris filius, Theodorus marchio, animo, religione, cultu *et tonsu barbæ plane Latinus*.”

Chalcondilas, another Greek or Byzantine writer, puts the matter in a nutshell, and his language is clearer than broad daylight: “Itali et Occidentales pene omnes barbam radunt.”<sup>6</sup>

Finally, Manuel Calecas, a Greek himself who joined the order of St. Francis, wrote a work of four books against the calumnies of the Greek Schismatics. In his chapter “De Tonsura Crinium,” does he deny the charge that the Latin Priests shave their beards? No, he admits it, explains and accounts for it: “Ne scilicet ad

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., col. 743.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., col. 790.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., col. 799.

<sup>4</sup> Apud Catal. ubi supra.

<sup>5</sup> L. I., c. vi. Migne. Patr. Gr., T. 156, col. 664.

<sup>6</sup> De Rebus Turc. apud Thomass, l. c.

sanctorum mysteriorum communionem accedentibus Salvatoris sanguine capilli intingantur sive inficiantur.”<sup>1</sup>

We have, in the authorities above quoted, a charge made by the Greeks against the Latin clergy from the very days of Photius, who lived in the ninth century; we find that charge insisted on by many Greek writers, laid stress on and magnified into one of the reasons of protracting the schism. It was easy, if the charge was false, to deny it, and to remove that bone of contention. If that charge was not true, charity made it imperative to the Latins to inform the Greeks that they labored under a false impression. The Latins did not do so; they admitted and had to admit that the fact of their shaving their beards was true; instead of denying it, they justified it by asserting that their custom originated with St. Peter, by showing how difficult it was for a bearded priest to drink, without danger of profanation, the precious blood during Mass. In the face of this abundant testimony, no sensible man, except he be hopelessly prejudiced, can deny that the Latin or Western Church generally kept up the custom of shaving off the beard.

And if any one is tempted to do so, we will beg him to ponder the following words of Ratramnus, Abbot of the Benedictine Monastery of Corbie in Picardy. We quote from the fifth chapter of the fourth book of his work against the Greeks; and let it be remembered that Ratramnus belongs to the ninth century, and was contemporaneous with Photius: “Jam videamus quod de barbæ tonsione clericos culpæ non tantum Romanorum, verum omnium Occidentalium Christi Ecclesiarum non verentur.” Then, speaking of the whole Church, comprising both Eastern and Western churches, he admits that, with regard to hair and beards, the practice is not uniform all over the world, and should not be made a matter of dispute and contention. He proceeds with reference to the Latin Church: “Ne longe positos vel Romanos vel Latinos leviter reprehendant: qui *si radant barbam*, comam tamen non nutriunt. . . . Hunc morem sequentes *clerici Romanorum, vel cunctarum fere per Occidentem Ecclesiarum barbas radunt*, et capita tondent, formam accipientes tam ab eis qui in Veteri Testamento Nazaræi dicebantur, quam ab eis qui in Novo Testamento talia fecisse leguntur. . . . Beatus quoque Petrus apostolus, necnon et alii tam de numero apostolorum quam etiam de Christi discipulorum, leguntur et barbas et capita rasisse. Siquidem hoc egisse Petrum, ipsius hodieque testantur imagines, quæ tali schemate pictorum arte formantur.” After words so clear and convincing, it is unnecessary to insist on the testimony of Cœneas, Bishop of Paris, who lived at the time of Ratramnus; we will give only the begin-

<sup>1</sup> Migne Patrol. Gr., T. 152, col. 213.



ning of his chapter on this matter: "Cum ergo Græci Latinos et Romanos redarguant cur barbas radant, qui ob munditiam utique hoc agunt, quam expressius ecclesiasticum expedit et exposcit ministerium."<sup>1</sup>

IV. After placing together the arguments connected with the Greek schism, we now continue our demonstration of the constant and universal practice of shaving in the Latin Church. Surius relates that St. Adalbertus, bishop and martyr in the tenth century, proposed to his clergy to disguise themselves in order to be better received by the Barbarians they intended to convert: "Vestimentum mutemus, clericam (comam?) æqualem pendentibus capillis crescere sinamus, *tonsæ barbæ comas* prodire non prohibeamus:"<sup>2</sup> An evident proof that he was in the habit of shaving. A deacon mentioned by Amulo, Bishop of Lyons, in his book against the Jews, falsely ascribed by Thomassinus to Raban Maurus, leaves the Church, becomes a Jew, takes a wife *and lets his beard grow*: "Ita ut et superstitione et habitu totus Judæus effectus, quotidie in Synagogis Satanae *barbatus* et conjugatus, cum ceteris blasphemet Christum et Ecclesiam ejus."<sup>3</sup> Amulo and Raban Maurus lived in the ninth century. A similar statement is made by St. Bernard, who inveighs against clerics and priests abandoning their calling and letting their beards grow: "Clerici ac sacerdotes, ecclesiis, populisque relictis, *intonsi et barbati* apud eas inter textores et textrices plerumque inventi sunt."<sup>4</sup> And yet painters and engravers *will* give St. Bernard a long mustache! We are aware that Gaufridus, in the third book of his *Life of St. Bernard*, says that the latter's beard was of reddish hue: "Barba subrufa, circa finem vita ejus respersa canis." But we venture to doubt whether those words imply that St. Bernard wore beard habitually. Indeed his statue, standing on the top of his tomb in Clairvaux, represents him without beard. The fourth volume of Migne's edition of St. Bernard contains a cut of that mausoleum.

We have, thus far, given a sufficient amount of testimony to prove that the custom of shaving among the Latin clergy is *anterior* to St. Gregory VII. and Leo XII., to whom a flippant writer in the French *Dictionnaire de Conversation et Lecture* ascribes both the origin of that custom and the intention to establish a conspicuous difference between the Eastern and the Western clergy; an intention both impious and absurd. The same statements were copied, with much servility, into *Appleton's American Cyclopædia*, not even barring a mistake in

<sup>1</sup> Lib. adv. Græc., c. 186.

<sup>2</sup> Thomass. Part. I., L. ii., c. 40.

<sup>3</sup> Amulo. Lib. contra Jud., c. 42.

<sup>4</sup> Serm. 67 in Cantic.

print. Let us now run rapidly over the epoch of St. Gregory VII. and the centuries following until the time of Julius II.

St. Peter Damian wrote a graphic description of the low state of morality in his days; we presume it was not worse then than it is now; but that is bad enough. When speaking of the "*Ecclesiarum Rectores*," he incidentally states that the shaving of their beards discriminated them from the laity: "*Ecclesiarum quoque Rectores, quibus potissimum hujus rei cura debuisset incumbere, tanto mundanæ vertiginis quotidie rotantur impulsu, ut eos a sæcularibus barbirasium quidem dividat, sed actis non discernat.*"<sup>1</sup> That letter was written to Alexander II., predecessor to St. Gregory VII.

The same fact that the "*barbirasium*" was a distinctive mark of the clergy is alluded to in another place by the same holy doctor: "*Presbyterum vel Episcopum abire prospiciunt, barbirasos se videre fatentur,*"<sup>2</sup> and by William of Malmesbury when he relates that the Anglo-Saxons thought William the Conqueror's army consisted of priests *because his soldiers were all shaved*. As his narrative is very interesting, we may be permitted to give it in full: "*Præmisit tamen Haroldus qui numerum hostium et vires specularentur; quos intra castra deprehensos Willelmus circum tentoria duci, moxque, largis eduliis pastos, domino incolumes remitti jubet. Redeuntes percunctatur Haroldus quid rerum apportent: illi, verbis amplissimis ductoris magnificam confidentiam prosecuti, serio addiderunt, pene omnes in exercitu illo presbyteros videri, quod totam faciem cum utroque labio rasam haberent; Angli enim superius labrum pilis incessanter fructificantibus intonsum dimittunt, quod etiam gentilitium antiquis Britonibus fuisse Julius Cæsar asseverat*<sup>3</sup> *in libro Belli Gallici. Subrisit rex fatuitatem referentium, lepido insecutus cachinno, quia non essent presbyteri, sed milites armis validi, animis invicti.*"<sup>4</sup> Matthew Paris puts the same words in the mouth of Harold's spies.<sup>5</sup>

Ratherius, Bishop of Verona, will lend us two passages where the same distinctive mark is mentioned to know the clergy from the laity. Speaking of the clergy of his time with the figure of speech called "*anakoinosis*," including himself, he says:<sup>6</sup> "*Relicto ritu, cultu, habitu quoque nostro, ipsius mundi consuetudine atque studiis, amictibus etiam in tantum utimur ut solo, ut ita loquar, barbirasio et corona, . . . in nullo alio a sæcularibus videamus*

<sup>1</sup> Lib. i., Ep. 15.

<sup>2</sup> S. Pet. Dam. Opuse. 30, c. 3.

<sup>3</sup> "*Capilloque sunt promisso, atque omni parte corporis rasa, præter caput et labrum superius.*" Cæs. De Bello Gall., Lib. v., c. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Willem. Malmesb., Gesta Regum Anglor., Lib. iii., § 239.

<sup>5</sup> Apud Thomass. ubi supra, c. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid.

dissimiles."<sup>1</sup> Again: "Unde ad tantum consuetudo et majorum eos (clericos) exempla jam olim impulerunt impudentiam *ut solummodo barbirasio* et verticis cum aliquantula dissimilitudine vestium . . . a ritu distare eos videas laico."<sup>2</sup>

Gerson, on the contrary, bewailing the laxity of the clergy of his time, who had given up even that mark of distinction, asks: "Ubi clerici comam barvamve ne nutriant?" . . . "Where, now, do the clergy shave?"<sup>3</sup>

We borrow the following quotations from Thomassinus.<sup>4</sup> The Council of Bourges, in 1031, speaking of all cleric from the highest rank to the lowest, says: "Tonsuram ecclesiasticam habent, hoc est, barbam rasam et coronam in capite:" a conspicuous proof, as we have seen, that a shaved beard is part and parcel of the ecclesiastical tonsure. In 1050 the Council of Coyac, in Spain, speaking of priests and deacons, enacts: "Semper coronas apertas habeant, barbas radant." In 1119 the Council of Toulouse ordains: "Si quis ecclesiastica militia titulo insignitus, monachus, vel canonicus aut quilibet clericus, primam fidem irritam faciens, retrorsum abierit, aut tamquam laicus *comam barbamque nutricrit*, Ecclesia communione præivetur, donec prævaricationem suam digna satisfactione correxerit." In 1337 the Council of Avignon, having mentioned the shaving of the beard and crown, continues: "Quam tonsuram singulis mensibus radi facere teneantur:" this was the last limit of time, for a fine was inflicted on those that neglected it. In 1342 the Council of London decrees severe punishment against the clerics that neglect the shaving of beard and crown: "Coronam, quæ regni cœlestis et perfectionis est indicium, deferre contemnunt; barbis prolixis incedunt." In 1528 the Council of Sens decrees: "Nec comam relaxent, nec barbam nutriant; sed tonsuram, coronam, seu rasuram habeant, secundum ordinem suum honeste rasam." In 1549 the Council of Mayence: "Barbam non nutriant, tonsuram et coronam deferentes." In 1551 the Council of Narbonne: "Barbam radant, saltem emel in mense, clerici sacros ordines consecuti, maxime canonici." The ordinances of Eustace of Bellay, Bishop of Paris, during the Council of Trent, direct his priests to attend the synod, "tonsura et barbarasi." And behold an American council: "Comam non nutriant, barbam novacula radant, vel ita recidant, ut nihil sæculare remaneat, quod populo ludibrio esse possit." (Conc. Mexic., L. iii., tit. v., § 2.) To this long list of authorities we will add what the Council of Lateran, under Leo X., in 1514, says on this subject: "Non comam, non barbam nutriant." (Sess. ix.)

<sup>1</sup> Epist. ad Widdon. et Sobbon., Lib. v., Prolog.

<sup>2</sup> De Cont. Can., Parte 2, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup> Apud Thomass., ubi supra.



We have now arrived at the age illustrated by that great lover and defender of Ecclesiastical Discipline, St. Charles Borromeo. But, before quoting the words of that holy cardinal, we wish first to explain two facts which might be considered as objections to our thesis, and then to make special mention of the regular clergy with regard to the subject under consideration.

V. To the ambassadors of the Franks, who were on their way to Constantinople, the clergy of Italy wrote as follows: "Ipsum Sanctum Pontificem (Vigilius) milites alii a pedibus, alii a capillis et barda tentum crudeliter abstrahabant." Was Vigilius in the habit of wearing beard? We do not think so. His likeness among the portraits of the Popes in the Church of St. Paul "fuoride-muri," at Rome, represents him with a smooth-shaved countenance. We can easily account for the fact of his having had beard at the time of his captivity at Constantinople, when he sought refuge from the cruelty of Emperor Justinian in the Basilica of St. Peter. It is possible, as Christianus Lupus says,<sup>1</sup> that mourning as he did for the evils to which the Church was subject, he intended by letting his beard grow to show on his person a public token of his sadness. Thus also acted Albero, Archbishop of Trier, of whom the *Magnum Belgii Chronicon* says: "Per coronam capitis sui iuravit numquam barbam se rasurum." And why? Because of the loss of temporalities his Church had sustained at the hands of iniquitous oppressors. But it is much more probable that, as Catalanus says,<sup>2</sup> Vigilius, a captive as he was in the power of Justinian, was denied many of the comforts of life, and his beard was merely the result of his captivity.

The second fact, to which we referred above, is so much the more deserving to be examined, that, instead of being an objection, it serves rather to corroborate our thesis. Luitprand, or, as Migne has it, Luitprand, legate of Emperor Otho to the Greek Emperor Nicephorus Phocas, wore a long beard. But his beard was a matter of surprise to Christophorus, the Emperor's patrician and chamberlain. Christophorus saw in Luitprand's beard a mark of mourning; this he expressed to Luitprand, saying: "Ostendunt pallor in ore sedens, macies in corpore toto, crinitum caput, *prolixa contra morem barba*, immensum cordi tuo inesse dolorem, eo quod redeundi ad Dominum tuum terminus est dilatatus." The words *contra morem* are deserving of notice, as they demonstrate the *Latin* custom of shaving. It is undoubtedly of the *Latin* custom that Christophorus makes mention, and the word "Latin" is added by Christianus Lupus, who adduces this narrative. In his answer to Christophorus, Luitprand gave another explanation of his beard,—it was simply to meet with less displeasure on the part of the Greeks. A

<sup>1</sup> De Oct. Syn. Gen., c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> In Pont. Rom. ubi sup.

letter had been received from Pope John XII., in which Nicephorus Phocas was styled Emperor of the Greeks; Luitprand was summoned to explain, and said: "Quia linguam mores, vestesque mutastis, putavit sanctissimus Papa, ita vobis displicere Romanorum nomen, sicut et vestem." The "Romanorum nomen" is an allusion made to the name given to Nicephorus by the Pope, who had called him Emperor of the Greeks instead of Emperor of the Romans.<sup>1</sup> Thus his beard was merely a matter of policy.

VI. It is necessary to make a special mention of the regular clergy. A Lapidé, as we have seen,<sup>2</sup> makes a distinction between the secular and regular clergy, and asserts that the secular clergy were obliged, not to shave, but to cut their beards, whilst the monks, as dead to the world, were in the habit of shaving. What he said of the secular clergy is untenable, as the authorities quoted above prove to the utmost evidence. What he says of the regular clergy is true, and, as it is not unusual to hear the contrary opinion expressed by persons who have not given this matter sufficient attention, we beg to give a few proofs to demonstrate that the monks in the West shaved. We passed by before the words of St. Jerome against bearded monks, let us confine ourselves here to one of his invectives, and this not the most lenient one against them: "Videas nonnullos, accinctis renibus pulla tunica, *barba prolixa*, a mulieribus non posse discedere."<sup>3</sup> We have already given the words of St. Columban, who obliged his deacons to shave under pain of six lashes. Rabanus Maurus, Ratramnus, St. Adalbert, Ratherius, mentioned above, were all members of the illustrious order of the Benedictines; St. Peter Damian was of the order of the Camaldoli. When St. Francis and his companions applied to Innocent III. for an approbation of their rule, they were denied that favor, and one of the causes was, according to Matthew Paris, their long beards: "Prolixa barba."<sup>4</sup> Since that time the Franciscans shaved, so do the Dominicans, and when some of the children of St. Francis clung obstinately to their beards, that illustrious order was split, and the Capuchins separated from the main branch. So unusual was it to see monks with beards, that a monastic order called "Fratres Templi," and mentioned by Alberic, were called "Fratres Barbati," by reason of their beards.<sup>5</sup> Let it not be said that the writers we have quoted were "misopogones," and were induced to speak by a natural aversion for beards. St. Peter Damian, to whose clear, unequivocal language we have listened, does not profess any horror for the wool of the human face. Explaining the verse "defluabant

<sup>1</sup> Luitpr. Cremon. Legatio Constantinop., n. 50, seqq.

<sup>2</sup> In cap. xix. Levitic. <sup>3</sup> Ep. ad Rusticum.

<sup>4</sup> Christ. Lup. De S. Leonis. Actis, c. 15.

<sup>5</sup> Alber. ann. 1113 apud Ducange V. Barbati.

salivæ ejus in barbam" (I Reg. xxi.), he says: "Sane quia barba viri est proprium, quid est per mysticum intellectum, nisi virtutis indicium? Quid per barbam, nisi divinitatis innuitur fortitudo?"<sup>1</sup> And yet, speaking of a hermit, Martinus Storacus, and mentioning his long hair and beard, he adds the unqualified expression of his disapprobation: "Iam per triâ ferme lustra non prodiit, sed neque capillos totondit, neque barbam rasit. Hoc siquidem et ipsi crines evidenter asserunt, qui jamjam forte prolixiores illo talotenus fluunt. Quamquam nos hoc distractionis genus minime probemus."<sup>2</sup>

The most convincing proof that the regular clergy were in the habit of shaving is, that the absence of beard was the distinctive mark whereby regular monks were discriminated from lay-brothers; so much so that the latter were called "Barbati." A few arguments will suffice. Martene, quoted by Catalanus,<sup>3</sup> after showing by conclusive evidence that the priests, and especially the monks of St. Benedictus, abstained from wearing beards, makes the remark: "Fratres laicos et illiteratos, quos vocant conversos, in eo a monachis clericis fuisse distinctos, quod ipsi oblongam, promissamque barbam nutritent;" and he quotes the *Life of St. Hermenoldus*, the work of an anonymous writer, where (lib. ii., c. 2) is narrated the punishment of a brother, one of those that are called "bearded:" "Ex ipsis quos *barbatos* dicimus," whilst the heading of the chapter is, "De quodam Fratre *Converso* graviter punito." Chrysostomus Henriquez, in his *Life of St. Alberic*,<sup>4</sup> relates the deliberation and decision of the Cistercians to admit "bearded" lay-brothers into their order: "Tunc definierunt, conversos laicos *et barbatos* se suscepturos, et homines etiam mercenarios, quia sine adminiculo istorum non intelligebant se plenarie die sive nocte præcepta Regulæ posse servare." Cæsarius Heisterbach, quoted by Ducange,<sup>5</sup> uses that expression frequently when speaking of lay-brothers: "Die quadam *Conversum* ad se vocans, ait, Nosti, *Barbate*, quare venerim ad ordinem?" (lib. iv., c. 62), and "Tales sunt multi ex his *Barbatis*, qui in habitu et tonsura religionis, terras circumeunt, et plurimos decipiunt," (lib. vi., c. 20.) The "Chronicon Montis Sereni"<sup>6</sup> says plainly: "Quidam Fratrum laicorum quos *Barbatos* vocari usus obtinuit." No wonder, therefore, that Ducange gives the following meaning to the expression "Fratres Barbati," in his learned Glossarium: "Fratres Barbati, sic appellati ut plurimum Fratres Conversi in monasteriis, quod, contra quam Monachi, voto astricti, barbas nutritent." Another argument we borrow from Stephen, Bishop of Tournay, who in one of his letters complains bitterly of the conduct of lay-brothers, and alludes to their

<sup>1</sup> Term. 67.

<sup>3</sup> In Pont. Rom., loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup> V. Barbatus.

<sup>2</sup> Opusc. 51., cap. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Apud Catalan., loc. cit.

<sup>6</sup> Apud Ducange v. Barbatus.



beards. Stephen of Orleans was Bishop of Tournay at the end of the twelfth century, and was one of the Pope's deputies who was directed to re-establish peace between the fathers and lay-brothers of the convent of Grandmont. We would wander from our subject if we described at length the troubles to which the Order of Grandmont, founded by St. Stephen de Muret, under St. Gregory VII., was subject at that time. We will only quote the beginning of St. Stephen's letter: "Luctuosum in Ecclesia Dei spectaculum fidei ac flebili compassione dignum. Prosequuntur Grandimontenses conversi miserabilem cætum clericorum exultantium, *barbas prolixas* tamquam cornibus ventilantes."<sup>1</sup>

Our last argument to establish the fact that beards were a distinctive mark to know lay-brothers from monks, will be a few old verses, where lay-brothers, with their long beards, immense shoes, and thousands of "Pater noster" are graphically and pleasantly described. We hope the lay-brothers did pray for the pardon of the writer's uncharitableness:

"Nunc quoque Barbati qui sint attentius audi.  
Sunt ergo laici Miliensibus (Monachis) associati,  
Quos risus populi dedit hoc agnomine fungi.  
Sunt quia prolixis barbis ad pectora pexis  
Deformes, hirti, revera moribus hirci,  
Barbis hircorum similes, larvis tragicorum.  
Quos quia vulgaris circumfert aura favoris  
Austera facie sunt, et tonsi caput alte,  
Cautius incisis certoque tenore capillis,  
Et sunt immensis induti calceamentis,  
Amphibalis longis utentes et spatiosis,  
Quos quid habere putant, submissa fronte salutant,  
Gratia, Pax Vobis, Benedicite, Credite Nobis,  
Mille Pater Noster, mandat grex tibi noster.  
Per venias centum verrunt barbis pavementum,  
Ut domini servos plebs mobilis æstimet ipsos.  
Verum fallaces fore se produnt et inanes," etc.<sup>2</sup>

This is more than enough to prove, beyond the pale of doubt, that the regular clergy did not wear beards any more than the secular clergy.

VII. Julius II., as we have seen, innovated in this point of discipline by letting his beard grow. Let us bear in mind that the Pope is not, strictly speaking, subject to a law purely human, merely ecclesiastical; Julius II., therefore, cannot be called a transgressor of ecclesiastical canons; but the same cannot be said of bishops and priests who, no matter whether the Pope observes an ecclesiastical law or not, remain subject to that law as long as it is in force. However, the example of Julius II. was imitated by many. In France a real "furor" in favor of beards was occa-

<sup>1</sup> Steph. Tornac., Epist., 135.

<sup>2</sup> Chron. Laurisham. apud Ducange, loc. cit.

sioned by Francis I. This monarch, having been wounded at the head, had to lose all his hair; by way of compensation he permitted his beard to grow without restriction; all his courtiers followed his example; from the court that practice spread in the city, from the city in the provinces, and the clergy themselves caught the *philopogonic* fever. So truly did the poet say:

“Regum ad exemplar totus componitur orbis.”

It is even related of Jean-Pierre Camus, Bishop of Bellay, that, at the beginning of his sermons, he would twist his beard into as many tresses as he had points to treat of; and as he proceeded, the divisions of his beard would vanish with the divisions of his sermons. The French rushed into the other extreme under Louis XIV. when, after the example of that monarch, beards all but totally disappeared. It was owing to the prevalence of the fashion of wearing beards, in the reign of Julius II. and Francis I., that so many Provincial Councils enacted canons to keep up the time-honored custom of shaving. St. Charles Borromeo was first and foremost among the champions of that ecclesiastical custom. He issued a Pastoral Letter in which, referring to the words of St. Gregory VII., he ascribes the origin of that practice to the first Christians; and having stated that he had given the example of shaving, he exhorted his clergy to imitate his conduct. “A majoribus nostris manasse pro barba radenda usum in Ecclesia, antiquiores picturæ declarant, et licet paucis ab annis alicubi fuerit intermissus, a pluribus tamen optimis sacerdotibus, antiquæ disciplinæ studiosis, mediolani rite observatum est. . . . In quo si facem aliis non prætuli, hoc tamen ipsum sentio mihi esse solatii, quo patres solent etiam læantes affici dum in læbonis rebus quas avent a filiis, anteverunt. Illud inquam experior quod vestra diligentia in re quam summopere in votis, ut observaretur, habebam, vos me tempore præcesseritis. . . . *Antiquum ergo, fratres dilectissimi, radendæ barbæ usum ex animo restituamus, eundemque ita restauremus ut cum barbæ depositione omnem in posterum ostentationem et superbiam una deponamus.*”<sup>1</sup> Prudent and wise as he was, St. Charles did not proceed with undue haste. In his first Provincial Council, in 1565, he confined himself to the following decree: “Comam vero et barbam ne studiose nutrant. Barba a superiore labro ita recidatur, ut pili in Sacrificio Missa Christi Domini corpus et sanguinem sumentem non impediunt.” He was more exacting in his fifth Diocesan Synod, in 1578, the 4th decree of which is as follows: “Barbæ radendæ institutum, a Patribus in Concilio Carthaginensi sancitum, quodque ex Summi Pontificis Gregorii VII. litteris longe antiquissimum esse perspeximus, jam

<sup>1</sup> Acta Eccl. Mediolan., Parte vii.

olim in omni fere Ecclesia, et in nostra hac Ambrosiana ad hæc usque tempora (ut nos vidimus) a plerisque sacerdotibus antiquæ sanctoris disciplinæ studiosis conservatum, ita in perpetuum retineri præcipimus ac mandamus, ut unusquisque sacerdos et clericus, quocumque gradu dignitateve præditus, *barbam radat*.”<sup>1</sup> St. Charles quotes the 4th Council of Carthage such as it is contained in the “Corpus juris.”

These ordinances of St. Charles Borromeo and the canons of the Provincial Councils of Sens, Mayence, Narbonne, etc., above quoted, give us abundant proof of the strenuous efforts made by bishops of various countries against the innovation of wearing beards. Did that legislation check it? Not effectually; no sooner were beards prohibited than they donned all the attractive charms of the forbidden fruit; and, probably, more than one “philopogon” would never have dreamed of wearing his beard if there had been no law prohibitory of the same. An amusing anecdote is related of William Duprat; having been appointed Bishop of Clermont, he proceeded, as bishop-elect, to take possession of his diocese and to receive the episcopal consecration on the festival of Easter. His beard vied in length and venerableness with that of Aaron. The cathedral of Clermont was full of people, eagerly anxious to see their new pastor, and the latter arrived in due time, when the chime of the tower made the air re-echo with merry peals. Whom did he meet in the porch of the Cathedral? The Dean of the chapter of canons, accompanied by two acolytes and brandishing an immense pair of scissors. The long beard was in imminent danger, resistance was impossible. Before ever the Dean could carry out his barbicidal design, William Duprat fled, exclaiming: “I stick to my beard, I give up my bishopric!” This anecdote, though printed in several books, is of doubtful authenticity; for William Duprat did become Bishop of Clermont, founded a college for the Jesuits in Paris, and died after a laborious and successful administration.

There was, then, since the pontificate of Julius II., a great want of uniformity in the Church as to the wearing or shaving of the beard; but there was, if we are well informed, constant and universal uniformity before the sixteenth century. It may be objected that St. Gregory VII. saw himself compelled to forbid a Sardinian archbishop to wear beard, himself and his clergy, which seems to point out a want of the alleged uniformity. But that objection falls to the ground as soon as we remember, as Christianus Lupus observes,<sup>2</sup> that Sardinia at that time belonged to the Greek Emperor, and that the Latin clergy felt an inclination to

<sup>1</sup> Acta Eccl. Mediolæn., Parte ii.

<sup>2</sup> Loc. cit.



follow the custom of the clergy of their sovereign. This inclination St. Gregory checked, by reminding them that it was the Roman Church, their spiritual mother, they were in duty bound to obey and imitate.

### 3. MYSTICAL SIGNIFICATION.

We do not purpose to inquire into the *natural* use or necessity of beards. Others have done so. With what success? We leave that to the judgment of others. If, as some maintain, the beard is a protection to the mouth, nostrils, and throat, it may be asked, why are women and youths denied that protection? Napoleon Bonaparte, who was a keen observer, wrote in his memoirs: "Orientals shave their heads and wear long beards; they are subject to sore eyes but keep their teeth. Europeans keep their hair and shave their beards; they lose their teeth but have good eyes." This, surely, is perplexing. What shall we do? Keep our teeth and sacrifice our eyes, or *vice versa*? But let us leave that speculation to others and explain the mystical signification the Church has affixed to the shaving of the beard. We beg to premise a remark of paramount importance; in assigning a mystical signification to a liturgical rite or an ecclesiastical practice we ought to be guided by the liturgy of the Church and by the words of authoritative ecclesiastical writers, and not by our individual judgment. If we follow the latter, we will find sometimes two contradictory explanations of the same thing, the one denying and destroying the other. Take as an instance woman's long hair. One may say,—inasmuch as woman has, naturally, long and plentiful hair, the author of nature has designed that woman shall be bareheaded and not cover her head, her hair being a natural headcover. But, in the mind of St. Paul, the design of the Creator is just the contrary: "Judge you yourselves; doth it become a woman to pray to God uncovered?"<sup>1</sup> The Apostle of the Gentiles directs women to cover their heads, *because* the Creator, by giving them long hair "for a covering"<sup>2</sup> has signified his intention that they should cover their heads. As in that matter we must take the Apostle as our guide, so we will also, in the subject we are treating, take the Church and holy fathers as guides.

I. The first signification of the shaving of the beard is a close imitation of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and a willingness to have a share in the mockery to which the Pagans subjected him, for Christ's sake, by shaving his head and beard. We find this spiritual signification clearly expressed in two Pontificals of the Benedictine monastery of Le Bec, in Normandy. The prayer to be said by the bishop when cutting the first wool of a juvenile

<sup>1</sup> I. Cor. xi. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., v. 15.

cleric, is as follows: "Oremus, dilectissimi, Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, ut huic famulo suo N., quem ad juvenilem perducere dignatus est ætatem, benedictionis suæ dona concedat; ut *sicut exemplo Beati Petri Principis Apostolorum, ei exteriora pro Christi amore sunt attendenda juventutis auspicia*, ita præcordiorum divellantur interiorum superflua, ac felicitatis æternæ percipiat incrementa, per eum qui unus in Trinitate perfecta vivit et gloriatur Deus, per immortalia sæcula sæculorum. Amen."<sup>1</sup> We need not speak any longer of the very respectable tradition that informs us that St. Peter was shaved by the Pagans; we have already proved it by the testimony of Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, St. Peter Damian, Ratramnus, the Venerable Bede, St. Gregory of Tours, and a very ancient chronology.

II. The expression, in the above prayer, "ita præcordiorum divellantur interiorum superflua," furnishes a second mystical signification attached by the Church to the shaving of the beard. Being a non-essential part of the body, one without which the body exists and lives, beards are a figure of the superfluous things of this world. When choosing God as the part of his inheritance, a young Levite is prepared to abdicate both licit and illicit attachment to worldly things, a sacrifice signified and indicated by the shaving off of a superfluous ornament of the body. Æneas, bishop of Paris, expresses the same thought: "Munditia ministrorum Christi pro radendis barbis, *illicita reseccando*, debet præstantius splendescere in operibus bonis, et omnimodis carere sordibus mentis simul et corporis."<sup>2</sup> Moreover, beards being a sign of virile strength, the shaving of the beard implies that we do not put our confidence in our own strength, which, before God, is but weakness. "Barbam quippe radunt, qui sibi de propriis viribus fiduciam subtrahunt."<sup>3</sup>

III. A third signification of the shaving of the beard is the similarity it establishes between Priests of the New Law and the Nazarites of the Ancient Testament. This spiritual meaning is expressed, among others, by Ratramnus: "Hunc morem sequentes clerici . . . *barbas radunt* et capita tondent, accipientes formam tam ab eis qui in Veteri Testamento Nazaræi dicebantur."<sup>4</sup> . . . As the Nazarites were persons peculiarly consecrated to God, so also the clergy are God's own. At the end of their vow the Nazarites were shaved, so also clerics are shaved. This comparison between the clergy and Nazarites, as to shaving, is so familiar to ecclesiastical writers that there is no need of dwelling on it a long time. And let no one object that, during the time of their vow, Naza-

<sup>1</sup> Apud Catalan, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup> S. Greg. Lib., Mor., c. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Lib. adv. Græc., c. 186.

<sup>4</sup> Contra Græc., opp. L. iv., c. 5.

rites were forbidden to cut their hair. In this comparison we must follow the fathers; and the point of comparison the latter insist on is, not the wearing of long hair, but the shaving of it, after the time of the vow had elapsed. "*Tonsuræ ecclesiasticæ usus a Nazaræis exortus esse putatur, qui, prius crine servato, denique ob vitæ continentiam caput radebant.*"<sup>1</sup>

IV. According to Ratramnus the shaving of the face is an exterior indication of the interior purity of conscience requisite in the clergy: "*In faciei vero denudatione, cordis ostendunt puritatem, illud innuentes apostolicum, ubi ait: 'Nos autem revelata facie gloriam Domini speculantes, in eamdem imaginem transformamur' (II. Cor. iii. 18). Facies enim capitis faciem cordis insinuat: sicut enim caput arx est cordis, sic mens, hoc locus, quæ cor appellatur, animæ culmen existit: debet enim facies cordis cogitationibus terrenis jugiter spoliari, qualiter puro sinceroque conspectu gloriam Domini possit speculari, et in eam per contemplationis gratiam transformari.*"<sup>2</sup>

V. To these spiritual reasons, or mystical significations of shaving the face, we may add, in conclusion, a very good practical account of the propriety of that practice, connected with the celebration of the holy sacrifice of the Mass; the face is shaved smooth lest the precious blood, at the holy communion, be absorbed by and run down the hair of the beard. Such is the answer given to the charges of the Greeks by Manual Calecas, whose words are partially written above: "*Ne scilicet ad sanctorum mysteriorum communionem accedentibus Salvatoris sanguine capilli intingantur, sive inficiantur, atque iidem rursus in sumendo cibo necessario quodlibet imbibant liquamen, sive alias quomodolibet defluant, atque ita non parvus error sit.*"<sup>3</sup>

We content ourselves, for briefness' sake, with this concise indication of the spiritual reasons and mystical signification of the practice of shaving the beard among the Latin clergy, and we end our dry, lengthy, inelegant dissertation with a synopsis of what we have written.

Our object was not to demonstrate whether priests in the United States are obliged to shave, or allowed to wear beard; the modern practice, the present discipline we have to follow is clearly contained in the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore: "*Barbam clericorum promissam nuper damnavit Pontifex Pius P. P. IX. Ecclesiasticis omnibus hac in re morem Romanæ Ecclesiæ, tamquam normam sequendam, mandamus.*" (n. 151.) What we had in view was to give an outline of the ancient, constant, and uni-

<sup>1</sup> Hugo de S. Vict., De Sacram, Lib. ii., Part. iii, c. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Lib. iv., Contra Græc., opp. c. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Loco cit.



versal custom of shaving in the Latin Church, contrary to false opinions and untenable theories held by some in this matter. At the outstart we met some texts of the Ancient Testament and some statements of holy fathers which we endeavored to explain, so that they might be correctly understood. After that introduction we divided our subject into three parts, to inquire into,—1. The Origin; 2. The Antiquity and Universality; and 3. The Mystical Signification of the Custom of Shaving followed by the Latin Clergy. The historical origin is derived from the custom of the Roman citizens, who wore no beards; its ecclesiastical origin is to be ascribed to the ill-treatment inflicted on St. Peter by Pagans, by whom he was shaved in derision. The origin of the custom of shaving implies its great antiquity; after indicating a few exceptions to the general rule, we adduced the words of St. Gregory VII. as a witness that its antiquity is equal to that of Christianity itself; and then, coming down the different ages of the Church we have gleaned here and there words of prominent writers whose testimony leaves no doubt that, in every period of the Church, the Latin clergy either shaved or cut their beards very short. We have laid particular stress on the accusations of the Greeks against the Latins, and on the answers of the latter to the former, showing, by the testimony of Photius and others, that the practice of shaving was a conspicuous fact in the Western Church. Refuting now and then an objection, we have made special mention of the regular clergy, showing that Western monks made no exception to the general custom of shaving; and the clear, explicit ordinances of St. Charles Borromeo have allowed us to dismiss that part of our subject after thus bringing it down to modern times. Finally, after quoting numerous councils by which the raising of the beard is prohibited and the shaving of the face ordered, as part and parcel of the Clerical Tonsure, we have added a short chapter containing the reason or mystical signification of the practice of which we had been treating.

Such is a brief account of our labor. And if, by the want of elegance in style, the prolixity of our argumentation, or the dryness of the manner in which we have handled our subject, we have exposed the patience of our readers to a sore trial, we humbly apologize and sue for pardon, concluding with the words of St. Augustine, which we make our own: "*Quisquis hæc legit, ubi pariter certus est, pergat mecum; ubi pariter hæsitat, quærat mecum; ubi errorem suum cognoscit, redeat ad me; ubi meum, revocet me. Ita ingrediamur simul charitatis viam tendentes ad eum de quo dictum est: quærite faciem ejus semper.*" (De Trinit., i. 3).

THE PAPACY AND THE EUROPEAN POWERS.

1870-1882.

*Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. to the Archbishops and Bishops of Italy, February 15th, 1882.*

*Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII. to the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic World, December 28th, 1878.*

OUR Holy Father, Leo XIII, has occupied the chair of Peter only four years, but in those years some significant changes have taken place in the attitude and bearing of several of the great European powers towards the Holy See. Still more remarkable are those changes when viewed in connection with the great political events that have marked the last decade in Europe, since, in fact, the occupation of Rome by the troops of Victor Emanuel, September 20th, 1870. Under that occupation the Papal States, which had been restored to the Pope and guaranteed to the papacy by the Congress of Vienna, disappeared as a principality, and were absorbed into the newly-formed kingdom of Italy. The Powers that, at Vienna, had solemnly sanctioned the restoration of the Papal States, now stood by and quietly permitted, where they did not covertly assist at, their spoliation. On May 13th, 1871, the "bill of the papal guarantees" was passed by the Italian Chambers. This measure guaranteed to the Pope the title of Sovereign; a most gracious concession to a sovereign without a state. But no; he had a state, for the same bill guaranteed him, out of all the papal territories, the palace and basilica of the Vatican, with a yearly revenue from the "Italian" treasury of \$645,000. By way of compensation for this yearly revenue the omnipotent Italian Chambers, in 1873, declared all the church property in Rome and its immediate territory to be the property of the nation, and since that date there has been a steady, or rather rapid, sale of that property to defray the royal expenditure and the ever-increasing public debt. Since that date, also, the Pope has been immured within the Vatican, for his capital has been filled with his enemies. The appearance of the late Pope Pius IX. even at a window of his palace before the crowd of people that filled St. Peter's Square on a great public festival, was the signal for a popular tumult, with danger of a revolt, attended by volleys of insults and blasphemy in the public press and in the streets. The removal of the remains of the same Holy Pontiff at dead of night within the past year was the signal for a repetition of such scenes, and an attempt on the part of a crowd of miscreants, undeterred by the police and military,

to seize upon and outrage the venerated remains. The few people who were arrested for such an insult to humanity received the slightest possible punishment from their lenient judges, and were set up as heroes and martyrs by the dominant faction in Rome. Subscriptions were opened to defray the expenses of their trial, and medals were struck in their honor; while the press known in Rome as democratic,—an insult to a noble name,—regretted that “the remains of the old fool (Pius IX.) had not been cast once for all into the Tiber.” So much for the law of the papal guarantees, for the Pope’s honorary title of Sovereign, and for his freedom of action and of movement in the city and the capital of the papacy, which the omnipotent Chambers had converted into the capital of Italy. If such a position be not one of actual imprisonment, attended by grave danger of personal violence, as well as by daily insult, it is hard to say what actual imprisonment means,—save that the Pope is not chained in a dungeon and fed on bread and water.

This last outrage, perhaps more than anything that had occurred since the seizure of Rome in 1870, opened the eyes of the Powers and of all honest men to the actual position of the papacy. Pius IX. to the last raised up his voice against the spoliation of the estates of the Holy See, as well as against the personal dishonor put upon the supreme head of the Roman Catholic Church and the Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ. He spurned the insult of the pittance offered him from the Italian treasury as he would have spurned any such offer coming from that quarter, in return for the revenue of which the papacy had been robbed, and which was more than made over by the sale of ecclesiastical property. In both positions he has been followed by his successor, Leo XIII.

Meanwhile other things had happened abroad, during the interval of the seizure of the city of the Pontiff and the present time, to open men’s eyes to the position of the Pope and to the place the papacy held in the affairs of this world. It must be remembered that although the Powers tacitly permitted or covertly aided the seizure of Rome and the absorption of the States of the Church by the House of Savoy, they never gave formal sanction to an act that repudiated the action of the Congress of Vienna. It was altogether the act of an individual and ambitious power, the culmination of a series of invasions and spoliations of the Italian states. The pretence of justifying the act by the popular suffrage of a packed city and state after the event, was eminently worthy of the statesmen who compiled the bill of the papal guarantees. The question as to whether or not it is better to have a united Italy, be it kingdom, republic, or whatever form of lawful government, is not the question now. Pius IX. was an ardent and intelligent



advocate of a united Italy. The present fiction of union is before the world. It was a union effected from first to last by force of arms, bribery, intrigue, and revolution. There was never a free popular consent to it, as in the more recent case of the North German Confederation amalgamating into the empire of Germany with the kingdom of Prussia as the leading power.

This is an important point to be considered, especially in the light of more recent events. The European Powers have never formally sanctioned the absorption of the States of the Church and the confinement of the temporal principality of the Holy See to the palace of the Vatican. Nor have they sanctioned the dependence of the Pope for support and freedom of action on the good-will of the King and Parliament of Italy. All that has been done in the so-called unification of Italy has been done in direct violation of the Congress of the Powers at Vienna, especially in regard to the Holy See. That great congress did not act unadvisedly in restoring to the Pope his temporalities and his sovereignty, which had been absorbed by the rapacity and tyranny of the first Napoleon.

Another important fact to consider is this: The very framing of the law of the papal guarantees shows that the Piedmontese King and Parliament felt and knew that they were dealing with a very different power from the other states of Italy which they had invaded and absorbed. We hear of no bill of guarantees for the King of Naples, or for any of the other invaded principalities. Then why draw up one for the Pope, who was perhaps personally the weakest sovereign of all in the matter of armaments? The reason is obvious. These men felt that they were here dealing with a different power and principality from all others; that the man whom they despoiled of his small estates in Italy was a ruler of the greatest empire in the world; that he had loyal and devoted subjects in every land, attached to every court, and the robbers could not count upon the issue. In touching the sacred ark they broke the covenant of all Christendom. Not bold enough to take the full consequences of their act, to formally dethrone the Holy Father and banish him from his stolen capital, they made the double mistake of keeping him there, in constant possession, on his own soil, a living witness and testimony of the wrong done, not to a mere personality, but to the whole Catholic world, and to all right and law, national and international. They kept him there, offering him a pitiful bribe out of the revenue of his despoiled estates, the constant object of the gibes and jeers and insults of his enemies, and of the devotion and affection of the Catholic world. Then occurred a repetition of the prophecy of Calvary, "When I shall be lifted up I will draw all eyes to me."

That was the mistake of the Italian government. The Pope

might be banished, but he could not be kept under lock or key with the fiction of freedom and sovereignty in the city that was his. The situation was an anomaly that could not last for any length of time. It creates a dual sovereignty and divided allegiance in Italy, and is a necessary source of internal disturbance and confusion to Italy itself. How the whole Catholic world felt in the matter was shown by its immediate rallying to the Pope. This imprisoned man showed himself, if possible, more powerful than ever over the vast millions in this world who recognize in him the authority of Jesus Christ, the succession of St. Peter, and the final power of decision in all that concerns the faith in which they believe, and the code of morals that they accept. With him they spurned the Italian offer of a pension, and eagerly took upon themselves the support necessary for himself and his court, and for carrying on the vast business of the Catholic Church at its centre.

Such a state of public feeling and action could only exist with regard to the papacy, which is essentially a spiritual power, and needs a certain stretch of soil where it may freely conduct the affairs of its spiritual kingdom, undeterred by menace and uninterrupted by insult. Such territory was given it in remote ages by free consent of the Christian Powers. With the disappearance of the Roman empire the See of Rome belonged to the successor of Peter. Again and again the Popes saved the city from the arms of the barbarians, and from the ambition of rapacious chieftains in and out of Italy. Its civil guidance fell naturally and by consent of the people into the hands of the Pope. Wars and invasions often drove him out, but he was invariably restored in the long run; the principality of Rome being recognized as his by right of possession and by international consent. International consent has not yet formally pronounced on the present situation; but in all former instances it has pronounced in favor of the Pope, not so much always out of personal regard for him as because when men come face to face with the question of the Pope's place in international affairs it is felt and recognized that he is the centre of the most conservative force in this world, and that to touch him is to touch the whole Catholic world in his person. The Pope at ease, the Catholic world is at rest; the Pope in trouble, the Catholic world is troubled with him, and more deeply than by war, or famine, or pestilence.

What has become of the other despoiled Italian princes? The world has forgotten their names. What has become of Napoleon III., before whose nod a world trembled just previous to the seizure of Rome? His very dynasty is wiped out, and his memory is detested in France. In 1872, two years after the seizure of Rome, the Prince and Princess of Wales, while on a visit to Victor Eman-

uel, paid a visit also to Pope Pius IX. In speaking to them of England he referred to his favorite hope of seeing that country restored to the Catholic faith. The Prince and Princess smilingly shook their heads at what they doubtless considered the visionary views of the venerable Pontiff. "Ah! my children," said the Pope, "the future is always full of surprises. Who would have imagined two years ago that we should see a Prussian army in France? Your wisest heads expected a thousand times sooner to see the Pope at Malta than Louis Napoleon in London. I am much happier than those who call themselves the masters of Rome, because I have no fears for my dynasty. God takes care of it. I may be driven away for awhile; but when your children and your grandchildren come to visit Rome, whatever may be the temporal possessions of the Pope at that time, they will see, as you do to-day, an old man dressed in white pointing out the road to heaven."

The Franco-German war of 1870-1871, created a new power in Europe, and shook France to its centre. To France came the republic, to Germany the empire. The French government, at first moderately anti-papal, finally showed itself as it does to-day, distinctly and aggressively anti-Christian. Nevertheless it has throughout maintained official diplomatic relations with the Holy See. Count von Bismarck had, for reasons best known to himself, early sought a rupture with the Vatican, and Baron von Arnim, the Prussian ambassador at the Papal court, rode proudly in with the Italian troops through the breach of Porta Pia. Later on the Prussian legation was withdrawn, and diplomatic relations between the Holy See and Prussia ceased. The history of the quarrel between Prince Bismarck and the Holy See and the Catholic subjects of Prussia is too well known to call for more than mention here by way of illustration.

Here then, after the seizure of Rome, at the time of and subsequent to the Franco-German war, was the Pope cooped up in the palace of the Vatican, despoiled of the Papal territory and possessions, and without a single government in Europe that he could call friendly, or which was ready to manifest its friendship by stretching forth a kindly hand towards him. He fell back upon the world of his spiritual subjects. France had withdrawn its troops, and though Thiers, a statesman who always defended the temporalities of the Holy See, was in power, the country was in such a state of confusion and distress, that he could not even if he would have helped. Moreover, France had been reduced for the time being to the condition of a second-class power. England was, as usual, steadily anti-papal. Germany, under the lead of Prussia and the policy of Prince Bismarck, became ferociously so. Russia, under Alexander II., a bitter persecutor of the Catholics,



stood coldly aloof. Austria was silent. Spain had troubles of its own, and even if it desired, was not in a position to help the Pope. Mindful of the prerogative and character attached to his office the Pope, on the eve of the outbreak of the war between France and Germany, had ventured to intercede with the combatants to stay the dreadful conflict. His offer was received with cool politeness by the King of Prussia, and laughed at by the public press of Europe as a piece of audacity or senility. Yet, suppose for a moment his intercession had been well received on both sides, as the intercession of Popes under similar circumstances had often been received before, would Europe have been the sufferer or the gainer?

There was another thing that intensified the hostility of the Powers to the papacy at this time. This was the definition and immediate acceptance by the Catholic Church throughout the world of the doctrine of Papal Infallibility, which set down in indelible words, forever, beyond doubt or cavil, that "when the Roman Pontiff speaks *ex cathedra* . . . he possesses, through the divine assistance promised to him in blessed Peter, that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer wished his Church to be endowed in defining a doctrine of faith or morals; and, therefore, that such definitions of the Roman Pontiff are irreformable of themselves, and not from the consent of the Church." This decree, following not long after the publication of the Syllabus, in which the evil tendencies and teachings of the age were so admirably summarized, set forth, and condemned, set the whole non-Catholic world ajar, and filled it with a clamor of rage and resentment against the Holy See, the papacy, the person and the supremacy of the successor of Peter. The whole edifice of the papacy was condemned in turn to be swept away and destroyed by those whom it so boldly and in such unmistakable terms had condemned. The secret sects saw the moment they had so long waited for at last at hand. Now was their hour and that of the powers of darkness. The pseudo-protection of Austria had been swept away by France and Sardinia. France in turn had to withdraw her feeble protection. Over broken France and shattered Austria rose triumphant, Protestant Prussia, yoking all Germany to her chariot-wheels. All the world was against this old man of the Vatican, who presumed to rebuke and teach a world. So these sects, with their tool, Victor Emanuel, marched in and shut up the Sovereign Pontiff and supreme teacher, as he called himself, of a universal Church, in a little corner of his own city, which they left him as house-covering with the gilded bauble of a sovereign title to amuse him in his dotage.

Such was the view the wise men of the world took of the situation immediately after the occupation of Rome, the issue of the Franco-German war, and the inauguration of the new and power-

ful German Empire, with a distinctly anti-Catholic and anti-papal policy, not only in its own dominions but actively throughout the world. Whatever power dared allow its subjects to criticise adversely Prince Bismarck's measures against the Catholic Church was warned and threatened. The Catholic press in France, Austria, Italy, and Belgium was compelled to use very diplomatic language in its treatment of Prussian, and especially Catholic, affairs. The English government even was remonstrated with, but, much as it detested the Pope at the time, it had regard enough for its own freedom of speech to tell the Prussian government, diplomatically, to mind its own business. It is understood that similar remonstrances were sent to the government at Washington regarding the attitude of Catholics in this country, with what effect may be easily imagined. Thus, while all the non-Catholic world was prepared to be adverse to the papacy, the most powerful of European governments set on foot an extensive anti-Catholic propaganda at home and abroad.

Things looked badly for the Pope and the papacy. They could not look much worse. The Pope's hands were tied and his tongue was tied. He was not allowed to communicate freely with his spiritual subjects. The dispossessed bishops and priests of Italy flocked around him begging for actual subsistence. The Church in Prussia was broken up. One by one the bishops were compelled to leave or were imprisoned. When priests died, there were none to take their places. There was no means of ordaining them. The ecclesiastical seminaries were invaded and closed. The religious orders of men and women had already been driven out. A complete stop was put to Catholic education. In many places the faithful gathered around desolate altars to pray to God. The anti-Catholic propaganda spread to Switzerland and similar scenes were witnessed there. Spain had already felt its influence. The Belgian liberals were busy at work, and, later on, France took the lead of all, while Italy continued desolate. Truly said Pius IX. to a party of American visitors: "I am more Pope in the American Republic than in any other country;" for here he was free to do and speak as he pleased. Even Mr. Gladstone took up the anti-papal cry, and exerted his great powers to the utmost to convince Englishmen, and all persons who could come within reach of his eloquence, that because of the Pope, and because of papal infallibility, it was impossible for a true Catholic to be a true Englishman and loyal subject of the sovereign. This was just what Prince Bismarck strove by act as well as word to impress upon the world. While Mr. Disraeli, who never spoke of the Pope without respect, and who entertained much the same views as M. Thiers regarding the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See, in the

debates on the Irish university question, warned the House of Commons that in Ireland there was a greater power than that of the Queen,—the power of an irresponsible sovereign, the Pope.

Thus did the Gentiles rage and the people utter a vain thing. Thus were the princes of this world arrayed against the Lord and against his Christ. Through all those trying years and scenes Pius IX. bore himself with invincible fortitude, patience, and hope. To his enemies, who were the enemies of the Church and of Christianity, he never yielded a jot. He never ceased, when occasion called for it, to maintain the claims, the dignity, and the inalienable rights of the Holy See. He never used fine words to oil over the acts of violence, outrage, and robbery that had deprived the papacy of its territory and the Pope of his personal liberty and freedom of action, and that had put him and the vast affairs he necessarily controlled on the charity of the faithful in all lands for support. He drew the attention of rulers to what these acts of robbery and open violation of every right, sacred and profane, meant. He warned them repeatedly and in burning words of the consequences of their own acts, not only with reference to the Holy See but still more with reference to their own subjects. They were stopping up religion and the channels of divine grace. They were teaching the people that there was no God. They were turning them away from religion to irreligion. In Prussia, according to the Falk laws, there was no further need of religion at birth, marriage, and death. Man's life could pass very well without it. He could come into life, marry, and go out of life without the blessing of God. The sacraments of baptism, of marriage, and of extreme unction were thus tossed aside as useless, and so with the rest of the sacraments. And what substitute had the people for the hand of God? The hand of the state. A civil magistrate signed a piece of paper and all was over. For "in the dominion of this world," as Prince Bismarck proclaimed in one of his speeches at this time, "the state has dominion and precedence." If recollection serves, it was in the same speech that he gave utterance to the much-applauded phrase: "We will not go to Canossa."

Those were brave days for Prince Bismarck. He had, in the phrase of Napoleon III., "crowned the edifice." He had taken the German supremacy from Austria and the European supremacy from France, and made Prussia the head and centre of the greatest German Empire that had ever existed. The people of Prussia and of Germany, in the first flush of their brilliant conquests, were ready to follow their leader anywhere and to any extent. With him they raged and scoffed at the feeble old man of the Vatican. They gave Prince Bismarck full rein to suppress the freedom of Catholic worship in Prussia, and to turn, if possible, good Catholics into bad or



into no Catholics, with a view of making them better servants of the state. They allowed and welcomed the same measures for the Lutheran believers as did the Lutheran believers themselves, for the reason that the measures were so distinctly aimed at the Catholics. The warnings and protests of the Pope were unheeded, or only called out fierce rejoinder, and the work of consolidation of the German Empire went bravely on.

But there are greater and more lasting forces in the world than bullets and bayonets. There are the forces of truth and conviction, and the central truth is an omnipotent and just God, from whom all truth and power proceed. This doctrine was steadfastly denied by Prince Bismarck when he declared that in the dominion of this world the state has precedence and power. It has, but only as it accords with the revealed teachings of the King of kings and Lord of lords. Among Christian peoples those teachings are sufficiently well known, and the common Christian conscience is convinced of their truth, and recognize them as the only safe and lasting guidance and bond of human society in its way through this world up to heaven. That conviction lasts over all things, over the power of kings and tyrants, the changes of dynasties, of circumstances, of time, the absolute disappearance of great empires and nations. Over all the honest reader of history sees that an omnipotent power, to which the schemes and the passions of the mightiest men are often opposed, lives and reigns and governs, while allowing men to recognize or reject His power and His reality. Those who rebel against His divine law invariably disappear under the load of their sins.

Pius IX. spoke with the voice of a prophet and inspired teacher. He warned rulers that in depriving the Church of Christ of its free ministration among men, and in robbing the people of their faith in the central authority of Almighty God as expounded and inculcated by his divinely-appointed teacher, the Church, they were unconsciously sapping the roots of all authority and digging their own graves. In proportion as they drove out God they made room for the Devil and his angels. Very active among these latter were what are known as the secret societies, who had shown their hand in the French Revolution, and who subsequently, in 1848, had for a time succeeded in overturning nearly every throne in Europe. The avowed object of these societies was the overthrow of all existing order, "the strangling of the last king with the gut of the last priest." The warning, as usual, was unheeded, though so sagacious a statesman as Mr. Disraeli took it up and repeated it on the very eve of the outbreak of the Commune in Paris. Later on he distinctly charged that the revolt in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which led to the Turco-Russian war, that came

so near involving all Europe, was precipitated by the machinations of the secret societies.

These secret societies were not an unknown force in European politics. They were as old as the Albigenses, and older. They were the formidable assassins of the "Old Man of the Mountain." Possibly some of the knightly orders, whose vow was to defend honor, maiden purity, and Christendom, degenerated into secret sects. Frederick the Great of Prussia availed himself of the Illuminati, and from that time down they increased and multiplied in European society. They joined hands with the Encyclopædists of the school of Voltaire, and counted among their members the chiefs of the French Revolution. Louis Napoleon was a Mason, and after he became Emperor his life was attempted by Orsini for his supposed desertion of the sect. It is more than probable that his subsequent Italian policy was dictated by his old associates. He was used as their instrument to effect the "unification" of Italy and the presumed downfall of the Pope. The Popes had constantly pointed out the dangers of these societies from the time that they first became prominent as a force in European politics. Leo XII. denounced the principles that, calling themselves liberal, were undermining Church and state. Pius VIII., in 1829, repeated the warning of his predecessor, condemned the false philosophy of the day, indifference in religious matters, and the secret societies whom Clement XIII., Benedict XIV., Pius VII., and Leo XII. had condemned before him. The societies, therefore, saw in the person of the head of the Catholic Church, whether that head were Leo, or Clement, or Benedict, or Pius, their worst enemy.

Prince Bismarck, an associate—if not a friend—of Lassalle, the chief expounder and propagator of Socialism in Germany, used the Socialists and their press—as he is always ready to use any instrument at hand—in his conflict with the Catholics. They served him with zeal. The Catholic Church in Prussia was broken up so far as the order of its every-day life went. It was gagged and put under the ban of the Empire. The state was made supreme over it and all churches, and Prussians were emancipated, made free to go to the Devil without hindrance or warning from what before was recognized as the voice of God speaking through his Church, whether of the Catholic or Lutheran faith.

And what came of Prince Bismarck's triumph? Precisely what Pius IX. had predicted. A motto of Prince Bismarck's, which he applied to the Reichstag, is that "any stick will do to beat a dog." This is his policy. He uses whatever instrument he may have at hand to accomplish his purpose, and drops it when he finds no further use for it. Thus he, a sworn foe by tradition and disposition to everything that is called liberal or representative in govern-

ment, coquetted early with Lassalle, and later on, when the German Empire was formed, made use of the National Liberals, the Lutherans, and the Socialists in his war on the Catholic Church. These agencies enabled him to carry out his purpose and so alter the laws of Prussia that it was made penal to be a faithful Catholic. It took some time to effect this, for a number of able Catholics appeared in the Reichstag and disputed the ground inch by inch. Meanwhile the milliards wrung from France were working havoc in Berlin. Prussia is a poor country, and the sudden accession of so much wealth drove some people mad. As in Birmingham in the days of the Crimean War, so in Berlin after the entry of the milliards, workmen drank champagne out of pewter pots and rode to work in carriages. The riot was soon over, for the money was soon spent. Business grew dull, and pockets were empty. This is the first step towards revolution. In rags and hunger most revolutions are born. People existing under a rigid paternal rule like that of Prussia naturally turn to the government when they are in difficulties, saying: "We are poor; give us money. We are hungry; give us bread. We are naked; give us clothes." It is useless to prate to them of having wasted their means and opportunities. Prince Bismarck's legislation, his Falk laws, his "reptile" press had combined to eliminate Christianity from the minds and hearts of the German people. Respect for Divine authority had disappeared in great measure. There was little room left for respect for any authority.

So came up the Socialist party in Germany, in Prussia more particularly. This, which is the party of the secret societies, had its strongholds in the chief towns and leading cities, where men were employed in masses, and where strikes would paralyze industry and commerce. They were not of accidental growth. Their leaders were in league with all the secret societies of Europe, who saw with misgiving the uprising of so strong a power as that of Germany over the ruins of the empire of the Napoleons. Women joined with men in their advocacy of the people's cause, and sat and debated side by side with them in taverns over the wrongs of the people in the newly-erected empire. In a breath they cursed God and cursed kings, denounced priests and denounced the government.

Prince Bismarck and the Emperor saw with dismay the rise of this new party, whose advent they had invited and paved the way for by their war on the Christian religion. The Socialists sent their representatives into Parliament to obstruct Prince Bismarck's measures. They were bold and clever men, and they had a good ground for grievance in the constant increase of the army, of military armaments, and taxation for such purposes. On the other



hand, the Catholics showed a surprising strength. They rallied to the polls, they rallied to the faith, and in a short time mustered quite a strong party in the Reichstag, under leaders more able, in a parliamentary sense, than Prince Bismarck himself. The chancellor found himself obstructed on all sides. He is an ill-tempered man, faithless, when it suits him, to his promises. He broke with the National Liberals who had helped him to carry his anti-Catholic measures; he strove to quench the Socialists; he found the glamour of his conquests disappearing before the rags and hunger at home. The Catholics worked loyally together against him under the letter of the law. The Socialists worked disloyally, after their fashion, and broke out into open sedition. Within a short time two attempts were made on the life of the Emperor of this new and great empire, the second attempt nearly succeeding.

What might be called an epidemic of royal assassination ran around Europe about this time, nor has it yet ceased. Not an assassin, whether German, Spanish, Italian, or Russian, but was a member of a secret society, and the avowals of all on trial were much after the same pattern and showed a uniformity of doctrine. Meanwhile, prominent members of secret societies, such as Garibaldi, were pensioned off by the governments they conspired against, as they had been welcomed with honor by the government, people, and heir-apparent of such a power as England. Lord Palmerston would doff his hat to Garibaldi, while Mr. Gladstone would flout at Pius IX. Bismarck would take wine with Lassalle, and order Count Harry Von Arnim, whom his persecutions afterwards killed, to close the Prussian legation at the Vatican unless the Pope broke through the papal etiquette and allowed the Prussian ambassador to drive through the inner court of the Vatican in a one-horse conveyance. This last seems a ridiculous *canard*, but is a veritable fact, so much so that the Pope, who was as witty as he was holy, bade Cardinal Antonelli write to Prince Bismarck that His Holiness, taking compassion on the embarrassments of the diplomatic body, would in future allow the representatives of the great powers to approach his presence with one quadruped of whatever sort pleased them, an answer that must have delighted Prince Bismarck, who can appreciate a joke when he makes it himself.

Between the growth of the Catholic opposition, of the Socialistic body, and the gradual defection of the National Liberals, Prince Bismarck began to feel embarrassed. The German Empire enjoys, at least in form, a representative government, and under such a government the Parliament rules through the ministry under the crown. Prince Bismarck constitutionally chafes under any restraint, and to have these members from here, there, and every-

where, whose very names he did not know, opposing his measures and policy, was positive torture to him. In his impatience he pursued his practice of finding a majority anywhere he could to pass his measures, until he finally woke up to the hard fact that his home policy, at least, was opposed by the great body of the German people. Thus the question of the government of Germany, which Prince Bismarck thought lay wholly in his own hands, under the shadow of the Emperor, became more and more, day by day, a direct issue between the people and the crown.

But the people, where were they? Under the new laws they had gone socially and morally to wreck. Mr. Baring-Gould, in his *Germany Past and Present*, has been at pains to gather statistics as to church attendance. In all Germany only fourteen per cent. of the population attend religious service of any kind, while the Catholics, under the Falk laws, were in great measure actually prevented from hearing Mass and attending the sacraments. In Berlin, the capital of Prussia and of the new empire, only two per cent. out of 630,000 Protestants attend church on Sundays. In Hamburg 147,000, out of a population of 150,000, do not go to church at all. According to Mr. Gould, between thirty and sixty per cent. of marriages and deaths in Germany to-day, speaking more especially of the central power, Prussia, are without any religious ceremony whatever. While in Geneva, the capital of the republic that so readily took up the Falk legislation, out of a Protestant population of 25,000, Mr. Gould found 200 females and 23 males attending the solitary Sunday service in the city of Calvin.

There is no need to dilate further on this subject. The rulers of Germany woke up to find themselves confronted by a people, the great mass of whom were practical infidels. The rulers had helped to make them so in order to destroy, if possible, the one true conservative, social, and religious force that the Empire could count on,—the Catholic Church. Those who read history will always find that sooner or later the Lord makes his enemies his footstool. The noise of the conflict of the German giant with the Catholic Church had gone through all lands, and men looked with eager eyes to see the issue. What had been read of all the heresies and all the persecutions was being here enacted under the eyes of an age drifting to unbelief. The proud cry, the foolish and unnecessary cry, "We will not go to Canossa," was caught up and applauded through the world, at a time when the world was especially resentful against the papacy that had dared tell it it was going wrong. Step by step it watched the issue of the conflict between this German giant and the old man pent up in the Vatican, who, like Tennyson's infant, "crying in the night, had no language but a cry." And the world saw that things fell out just as

the old man had predicted. Prince Bismarck himself, and the Emperor, though sore reluctant, saw the same thing; that of all the elements of German society, the Roman Catholic, and those most nearly approaching to it in belief and practice, was the only conservative force in the best sense. Thus, as of old, the stone that the builders rejected was made the head of the corner.

In a social sense, but more immediately in a political sense, Prince Bismarck found the aid of the Catholics absolutely necessary in order to enable him to carry on the government of the country. In 1880 he was so disheartened at the condition of affairs that he offered his resignation, and advised the Reichstag to form a coalition government out of the Catholic and Conservative parties, as the only government that could keep the empire together and save the state. The Emperor refused his resignation, and he still retains power. Meanwhile Pope Pius IX. had died, following Victor Emanuel after a short interval; and a new Pope, Leo XIII., had been peacefully elected, succeeding his predecessor in the prison of the Vatican. But even before the death of Pius IX., there were attempts at negotiation between the Court of Berlin and the Vatican, with a view of establishing a *modus vivendi* in Prussia between the Catholic Church and the state. There was only one effectual *modus vivendi*, which was to undo Prince Bismarck's vicious anti-Catholic legislation.

Leo XIII. succeeded to all the onus of Pius IX. But the world at large was less hostile than it had been. The lesson of the Prussian persecution, of the visible social disorder in Europe, of the Paris Commune, of the attempts on the lives of sovereigns, was before it. It was seen in a broad way that there were grave dangers ahead to rulers and peoples; to morals, to law, and to property; and that unless heaven sent some safeguard, bullets and bayonets would not suffice. Curing was wanted, not killing; and the great healing force of the Catholic Church came largely into view. Its power had been exemplified in Germany. Its men had fought like honorable men for their rights through and by means of the very laws that proscribed them; while the Socialists, who recognized no higher law than their own will, flew to the dagger and the pistol for redress. The one force was constructive and conservative; the other destructive and hellish. Berlin, and several of the chief cities of Prussia, are in a state of semi-siege to-day, not by reason of the Catholics, but because of the Socialists.

Then came also the war between Russia and Turkey (1876-1877), and its results. It brought the great powers together at Berlin to rearrange the map of Europe and restore or create anew some Eastern principalities out of the territory that the Protestant Reformation and the jealousy of Christian princes, Catholic as well



as Protestant, had allowed the Turks to seize. A primary article in the constitution of the new principalities was religious freedom. The war, like all wars, let into Russia some new ideas, or gave a new impulse to hidden forces that had been working beneath the surface of Russian society.

The Freemasonry of Italy, the communism of France, the socialism of Germany, suddenly appeared in Russia in the wake of a disastrous war, in its naked form of Nihilism; a social Ishmael, its hand against every man's. The Czar, Alexander II, after many escapes, finally fell a victim to it, while his son and successor dare not shew himself abroad for fear of it. It is seen on all sides that the great Russian empire, so full of capabilities for good to itself and the world, full of heroism, devotion, and faith among the masses, full of corruption, venality, and rottenness in the church and in the state, is rocking in the throes of a new birth, which may be one of destruction.

There is not a nation in Europe to-day that stands without presage of change, and speedy change. England, the most conservative of all, is engaged not only with the everlasting Irish question in a form that appeals to all the world, but with an absolute revision and alteration of its own constitution. France, still calling itself a republic, advancing materially, has, under the inspiration of those whom it allowed to attain the power, arrayed itself directly against the Christian Church. Austria is full of troubles at home and troubles on its border. Turkey is waiting for dismemberment. Italy is between its own Scylla and Charybdis. And under all are the people. Kingdoms and kings disappear; but the people remain. What is to become of the people? is the question of the future.

And here the head of the divinely inspired and assisted Church of Christ comes in, in the beautiful words already quoted of Pius IX., to "point out the road to heaven." All history shows in the appearance and disappearance of races and powers that there is only one lasting code of morals: that of Christ, that stretches from the Redeemer to us and back to Adam. Following their own way, worshipping the gods of the Gentiles, great powers and peoples have gone down. The keeper, the guardian of this code, and the personage who, in this sense, is the centre of all history from Peter down, is the Pope. The Pope, like the Church, is everlasting. There is not an era, an epoch, a reign, in which he does not appear as a most important agent in human affairs, more important and more potent than all the bills that were ever passed by all the parliaments. Popes have been buried in the catacombs, have been banished from their see, have been imprisoned, have been martyred, and what comes of it all? The Church of God

elects a new head, and whether from the catacombs, the prison, or the throne, the voice of the Vicar of Christ is all-powerful, all appealing to the Catholic world.

This is the personage and power that yesterday's king and parliament of Italy undertake to coop up in a corner of the city that they stole from him; the man, no matter by what name he may be called, whose authoritative word is felt at once, as no living monarch's is, through all the Christian world. What is Rome, what is Italy to the Pope? A place to abide in, nothing more, save by the associations of history, of suffering, and of glory. Wherever he may go, wherever he may be, he is equally Pope and equally powerful. He cannot remain as he is much longer, politically a prisoner in his own territory, and dependent on a king who is an accident, a man of yesterday and not of to-morrow, who is and may not be in a day.

And this the whole world in its soberer sense is beginning to see. The taking of Rome and the seizure of the papal territory has effected what? The unification of Italy? Hardly. The pacification of Italy? Hardly. There is no throne in Europe so insecure as that of Humbert. Has the seizure and the robbery destroyed the papacy? Not a jot. It has only served to stain history with a new crime, and send abroad among the peoples a new example of sacrilege and violence. Is the Pope to remain forever a dependent on the bounty and the good-will of the Italian king and parliament? The Catholic world has already said no, and the man who would not go to Canossa says no.

In permitting the occupation of Rome and the seizure of the States of the Church, the European powers have saddled themselves with a lasting difficulty. Some were foolish enough to imagine that with this seizure ended what they considered the fiction of the papacy and its pretensions. Other monarchs disappeared with dispossession of their thrones. Not so the Pope. All the Popes may say with Pius IX., "I have no fears for my dynasty. God takes care of it." The Pope is of necessity a personage of unequalled international power and influence, who even in the affairs of this world cannot be counted out of statesmen's calculations. His decisions, his words, his actions, his very being intimately affect the affairs of states. The Pope may be Italian; the papacy is universal. The papacy has no nationality. Its power is the same in Germany as in Italy, in England as in Austria, in the United States as in Belgium. It can never descend into a pensionate of the kingdom of Italy; and if the king of Italy and his parliament make the position of the Pope untenable, as it is at present, and as it has been ever since the occupation of Rome in 1870, there is nothing left for the Pope but to seek freedom and

asylum elsewhere than on the soil of Italy. The law of guarantees secures nothing that it professed to secure. There is only one possible solution of the difficulty on Italian soil, and that is by undoing the wrong that has been done, restoring Rome to the papacy from which it was stolen, and thus realizing Cavour's maxim of a free Church in a free state. Does any one imagine, if the question were put to a fair Italian vote, that the will of the vast majority of the people of Italy would not be in favor of restoring Rome to the papacy, and thus securing the freedom of the Pope on Italian soil?

The question is beset with difficulties on every side. One thing is certain: the Pope cannot continue as he is. He must either leave Rome or be wholly free there. Rome cannot endure a dual or rival sovereignty. No city and no power could. The Pope could not walk the streets of Rome to-day without raising a riot and being insulted or slain by his enemies.

The Catholic world cannot permit this state of things to continue. It cannot permit its head to remain longer in dependence and danger. As said before, while he is restless all Catholics are restless with him. The question may be asked, "Who and what is the Catholic world, and what can it do?" Well, it is a part, and a powerful part, of every great nationality. In these days of loosening morals and growing social disorders, statesmen who look beyond the movements of the hour see in it the real and only safeguard of society. Prince Bismarck and the Emperor William have learned a bitter lesson from the anti-Catholic persecution that they either set going or sanctioned. Banish Catholicity from their empire, and how much faith would be left in a decade? The statistics already quoted show. On celebrating his eighty-fifth birthday recently, the Emperor, addressing a deputation, said that every new period of his life reminded him that it was the Almighty who at certain times chose his instruments. And going back to a text that has been frequent with him of late, he asked who among the monarchs could in these days consider himself safe? "The times are serious," said the aged Emperor. "Considering that the Czar a year ago had fallen a victim to party anarchy, who could now deem himself safe?" And he went on to lay stress on the importance of the spread of fervid religious feeling among the peoples, which is really the only safeguard of states; the very thing that the Falk legislation strove to banish from the heart of Catholic Germany.

It is quite possible that apart from the exigencies of politics and the strength displayed by German Catholics in parliament, that a man of Prince Bismarck's mind and understanding sees plainly the necessity of Catholic life as a national bulwark and sure social



defence. So he has actually gone to Canossa; that is to say he has gone back to common sense in his dealings with a great question. The question is this: Whether or not it were better for the state to have its Catholics good or bad. The object of the Falk legislation was to make them bad. It happily failed, but left a spiritual dearth and desert behind it, which Prince Bismarck, by a reversal of the legislation, is now attempting to make bloom again with the flowers and the fruit of divine faith and worship.

It was to the very Pope against whom he launched all his thunders that this great statesman turned in his hour of need. "The times," as the Emperor William said the other day, "are serious, and have been so for a long time past, and are growing more so every day." There is not a throne or government in Europe to-day that is not challenged by the people. In the minds of the masses the divine right of kings is an imposition and a superstition, for kings and statesmen have striven strenuously during two centuries to teach them that there is no divinity at all beyond the imperial I. Monarchs have assumed the awful title of "I am who am," and have been punished for their blasphemy. They have been shot and turned out and hustled through the world, and the people have discovered of what very common clay they are made. The tamed tiger has tasted blood, and is ready to make havoc. But the "old man, dressed in white, pointing out the road to heaven" remains.

To Pius IX., the prisoner of Victor Emanuel, the all-powerful German chancellor turned to help him govern the German people. Pius IX. died before the negotiations came to any head, and another old man dressed in white succeeded him. The negotiations were resumed with new eagerness. The German Chancellor, the embodiment of the strongest material power in the world, said to the prisoner of King Humbert: "Only tell your Catholics to vote my measures and I will undo all that I have done against them and against the papacy." The Pope did nothing of the sort. He confined himself strictly to his office of teacher and guide and guardian, not of German Catholics alone, but of the universal Church. He let German Catholics, saving religion and morals, go their own way home about home questions and policy. Then came the English government, a more persistent and subtle and ancient foe than the new German empire to the old man of the Vatican, to say to him: "Your Irish are turbulent. We can do nothing with them. Help us. Tell them to be quiet, and perhaps we may send you a representative."

And so, whenever a great social or political danger or difficulty arises, statesmen and all men of thought look at once to the head of the Roman Catholic Church to see what action he may take,

what advice he may give. Who looks in such emergencies to the Archbishop of Canterbury or the Patriarch of Constantinople? Men's eyes go at once to the centre of Catholic and Christian unity, who is to-day a prisoner in his own house and city. Prince Bismarck now discovers that the position of the Pope is an international rather than an Italian question. The Emperor of Germany has just as much interest in the person and office of the Holy Father as has the King of Italy. So has the government of the United States. So has any government that counts among its citizens a Catholic people; and what great government is without them? Here is how Prince Bismarck replied to Herr Virchow when asked about the new relations between Prussia and the Holy See:

"The King of Prussia," said Prince Bismarck, "as well as the sovereigns of other confederate states, had a vital interest in, as well as a responsibility which they could not neglect, of not neglecting the interests of their Catholic subjects at Rome. And the government had, therefore, the intention of introducing into the Prussian Budget on the next occasion, a vote of credit to enable it to carry on direct negotiations on questions which concerned persons, on local questions which were awaiting decision, and other more important questions in which principles were involved. The suppression of the embassy which formerly represented Prussia, and subsequently the Empire, at the Vatican had not been inspired by those principles which had dictated what was called in Prussia the *Culturkampf*. Some of his audience would remember how he had once declared that the government had been wounded by the tone adopted by Rome towards the Prussian government and the Emperor himself. It was for this reason that the embassy had been suppressed. But now," continued Prince Bismarck, "the subject of our displeasure has disappeared. We are on the most courteous and friendly terms with the present Sovereign Pontiff, and there is no reason why we should not occupy ourselves with Catholic interests of each confederate state. If, according to my view, this task concerns Prussia rather than the Empire, I am not influenced by a consideration of principles so much as by the actual facts of the situation. Still, if Saxony, Baden, Wurtemberg, and other States agreed that they had the same interest in the matter as Prussia, there would be no reason why the Empire should not be represented at the Court of the Holy See, 'which we consider not in the light of a foreign power, but as the Head of a Church.'"

There is the whole question stated with characteristic brevity. The question of the Papacy enters into every Power. Wherever a Catholic is, there is the Pope. The Powers, in their hour of dan-

ger, are getting over the mania of regarding the Pope as an enemy forever infringing on their prerogatives and power. They see him now, more especially in his hour of darkness and of desolation, as the heart and centre of the greatest moral force that this world knows. So Germany, England, Russia, Austria, throwing aside the fatal doctrines of the eighteenth century, hold out their hands to the Pope, and say: "Help us! our people are going astray! Help us to guide them to good!" And what answer can the Pope make? "I am chained. I am robbed. I am a beggar. I cannot move. I cannot act or speak with freedom. My city and my patrimony are taken from me, and I am as a stranger in my own land. The charity of the faithful supports me and enables me to carry on my work in a measure. But the work is obstructed on every side, and as I am, I am not only in danger myself, but a constant danger to this usurping Power."

The Pope cannot longer remain a prisoner in Italy in the city that belongs to the Papacy. He must be either made wholly free or given free asylum elsewhere. It is for Italians to say whether or not they are to lose the Pope. The loss would be Italy's rather than his. It is for the European Powers to say whether or not the head of the Church whose members form so important an element of the nations shall be in a position becoming the dignity and great demands of his office. It is for them to say whether or not the greatest sacrilege and wrong of the age shall be atoned for, and rest restored to the Catholic world.

---



## THE MONKS OF OLD.

*The Monks of the West.* Montalembert.

*Lives of the Saints.* Butler.

*Francis of Assisi.* Olyphant.

*Legends of the Monastic Orders.* Jameson.

*Catholic Flowers from Protestant Gardens.* Treacy.

THE word monk comes from the Greek *monos*, single, because the beginners of this manner of life lived as solitaries, without wife, children, or companions, away from human society. They were also called ascetics, from *askesis*, exercise, for that, like athletes desirous of bringing their bodily powers to perfection, these gave up all other concerns and devoted themselves in "spiritual exercises," to the strengthening and perfecting of their souls. When they formed communities under common government they were known as cenobites. Speaking generally they formed, and still form, what are called religious orders.

The institution, in one form or another, dates back to the earliest times. Thus we have the prophets, and those called sons of the prophets, the Rechabites, Nazarenes, etc., in the Old Law. Our Saviour and his disciples led a more or less monkish life. They observed celibacy, they lived on alms, and had all their money in one purse, the Apostles obeyed Christ, and he was obedient to his Father, and was led by the Spirit. The life of the first Christians was a similar communism, as it is described in the Acts. How long it lasted we know not, but all along the first centuries of Christianity we trace examples of the monastic profession. Illustrious among these are the names of Paul, the first prominent in history and called the first hermit, Anthony, who became the ruler and lawgiver of a multitude of solitaries in the deserts of Egypt, Hilarion, Macarius, Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, in the East, Martin of Tours, Vincent of Lesuis, and many others in the West. At the time of St. Jerome, the religious life, so called as it were *par excellence*, was practiced by many of the most illustrious and high-born men and women of the city of Rome even, and that great doctor was himself the spiritual adviser and leader of most of these. It was not until the year 325 that the Church being at last granted autonomy, her bishops were enabled to meet in General Council and regulate doctrinal and disciplinary matters. This being the case we need not wonder at finding a great variety in monastic organizations, a lack of order and permanency, and even much that was disorderly and even scandalous in the conduct of those who, in the disturbed condition of affairs and the absence of ecclesias-

tical sanction, had from one motive or another joined the communities. This was especially noted in the East, where diversity of language, race, practical independence of the bishops, and difficulty of communication with Rome, made possible and inevitable much that needed reformation. St. Augustine, in his work *De Opere Monachorum*, gives us a sad picture of the state of things, which was found in some parts of the West as well, for similar reasons. Mrs. Jameson, to whose books I am much indebted, presents a true though exaggerated account of the subject. "There were monks in the West from the days of St. Jerome. The example and the rules of the Oriental anchorites and cenobites had spread over Greece, Italy, and even into Gaul, in the fourth and fifth centuries; but the cause of Christianity, instead of being served, was injured by the gradual depravation of men, whose objects were, at the best, if I may use the word, spiritually selfish, leading them in those miserable times to work out their own safety and salvation only; men who for the most part were ignorant, abject, often immoral, darkening the already dark superstitions of the people by their gross inventions and fanatic absurdities. Sometimes they wandered from place to place levying contributions on the villagers by displaying pretended relics; sometimes they were perched in a hollow tree, or on the top of a column, or housed, half naked, in the recesses of a rock, where they were fed and tended by the multitude, with whom their laziness, their contempt for decency, and all the vagaries of a crazed and heated fancy, passed for proof of superior sanctity. Those who were gathered into communities lived on the lands which had been granted to them, and belonging neither to the people nor to the regular clergy, responsible to no external law, and checked by no internal discipline, they led a useless and idle, often a miserable and perverted existence. Such is the picture we have of the worst side of monachism up to the end of the fifth century." There is, however, a cloud of exceptions to this presentment, especially in the history of the Gaulish monks, as portrayed in the chronicles consulted by the illustrious Count de Montalembert.

About this period the Goths, Vandals, Huns, and other barbarians, about twenty distinct nations in all, began to burst all the barriers the decaying Roman Empire could oppose, and to overflow into Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa proper, Egypt, and the East. The state, corrupted and weakened by five centuries of licentiousness, venality, luxury, and despotism, could resist neither morally nor physically. Everything went down before the flood. "If the mighty waves of the Atlantic had rolled over Gaul," says a writer of that day, "I do not think that the ruin would have been greater." Fire and sword were carried everywhere, the officials of the government, soldiers and all, were demoralized; society was chaos.

Yet, even in this extremity, the base descendants of the conquerors of the world did not profit by the visitation of Providence, but indulged in sensuality, drunkenness, and shows, while their country's life was at stake. They seemed to say to themselves, "Let us eat, drink, and be merry, for to-morrow we shall die." Even the fresh, vigorous, and comparatively pure Northmen, when sated with blood and spoil, began to be infected with the vices of their victims, and the element of wildness was added to the conflagration that burned up the social edifice.

It was in this desperate state of affairs that many individuals, members of the old patrician families who still retained a love of virtue and nobility, felt inspired to retire from the mass of sin, to seek in solitude and nature that freedom to worship God and save their souls which was not granted them in their native towns. They were not priests, but were lay gentlemen. The clergy, of course, remained with their flocks, as in duty bound, and constantly labored, often with partial success, for their temporal as well as spiritual safety. Distinguished amongst those who retired from social life was Benedict of the Anicii, a family very famous in the history of the latter empire. This is the great patriarch whom God raised up to regulate and perfect monastic discipline, to give a great and lasting impetus to monachism and its works, to be the chief regenerator of European society, and the preserver of its civilization. Benedict (in Latin *Benedictus*, the blessed one, and surely he was well named) was born in the little town of Norcia, in the Duchy of Spoleto, Italy, about the year 480. He was sent to Rome to study literature and science, and made so much progress as to give great hopes that he was destined to rise to distinction as a pleader; but, while yet a boy, he appears to have been deeply disgusted by the profligate manners of the youths who were his fellow-students, and the evil example around him instead of acting as an allurement threw him into the opposite extreme. The example of Anthony, Paul, Augustine, Jerome, and other great men, was doubtless known to him, and desirous of living for God alone he formed for himself a hermitage even in the palace where he dwelt, and which we had the happiness of visiting and venerating last year in Rome. Having made up his mind, at the age of fifteen, to leave the luxurious capital, he was followed by his nurse, who had brought him up from his infancy and loved him with extreme tenderness. This good woman, doubtful, perhaps, if her young master were out of his wits or inspired, waited on his steps, tended him with a mother's care, begged for him, and prepared the small portion of food which she could prevail on him to take. But while thus comforted and sustained, Benedict did not believe his penance entire or effective; he secretly fled from his nurse and concealed



himself among the rocks of Subiaco, a wilderness about forty miles from Rome. He met there a hermit, named Romano, to whom he confided his pious aspirations, and then took refuge in a cavern, where he lived for three years unknown to his family and to the world, and supplied with food by the hermit; this food consisted merely of bread and water, which Romano abstracted from his own scanty fare. In this solitary life Benedict underwent many temptations, and he relates that on one occasion his imagination almost overpowered him, so that he was on the point of abandoning his retreat. Persuaded that the devil could be overcome only by extreme measures, the holy youth rushed from his cave and flung himself into a thicket of briars and nettles, in which he rolled himself until the blood flowed. Then the devil left him, and he was never again assailed by the sting of the flesh. They show in the gardens of the monastery of Subiaco the rose-bushes which have been propagated from the very briars consecrated by the blood of the hero.

The fame of the young saint now extended through all the country round; the shepherds and the poor villagers brought their sick to his cavern to be healed; others begged his prayers; they contended with each other who should supply the humble portion of food which he required; and a neighboring society of hermits sent to request that he would place himself at their head. He, knowing something of the morals and manners of this community, refused at first, and only yielded upon great persuasion, and in the hope that he might be able to reform the abuses which had been introduced into this monastery. But when there the strictness of his life filled these perverted men with envy and alarm, and one of them attempted to poison him in a cup of wine. Benedict, on the cup being presented to him, blessed it as usual, making the sign of the cross; the cup instantly fell from the hands of the traitor, was broken and its contents spilt on the ground. He thereupon rose up, and, telling the monks that they must provide themselves with another superior, left them and returned to his solitary cave at Subiaco, where, to use the strong expression of St. Gregory, he dwelt with himself; meaning thereby that he did not allow his spirit to go beyond the bounds that he had assigned to it, keeping it always in presence of his conscience and his God. But now Subiaco could no longer be styled a desert, for it was crowded with the huts and cells of those whom the fame of his sanctity, his virtues, and his miracles had gathered around him. At length, in order to introduce some kind of discipline and order into the community, he directed them to construct twelve monasteries, in each of which he placed twelve disciples with a superior over them. Many had come from Rome and from other cities, chiefly nobles, for it is gen-

erally amongst the rich or well-to-do that these sacrifices take place even to-day, and amongst others came two Roman Senators, Anicius and Tertullus, men of high rank, bringing to him their sons, Maurus and Placidus, with an earnest request that he would educate them in the way of salvation. Maurus was at this time a boy of about eleven or twelve years old, and Placidus a child of not more than five. Benedict took them under his peculiar care, and his community continued for several years to increase in number and celebrity, in brotherly charity and in holiness of life. But of course the enemy of mankind could not long endure a state of things so inimical to his power; he instigated a certain monk named Florentius, who was enraged by seeing his own disciples attracted by the superior virtue of St. Benedict, to endeavor to blacken his reputation, and even to attempt his life by means of a poisoned loaf; and this not availing, Florentius introduced into one of the monasteries certain bad women, in order to corrupt the chastity of the monks. Benedict, whom we have always seen much more inclined to fly from evil than to resist it, departed from Subiaco, but scarcely had he left the place, when his disciple Maurus sent a messenger to tell him that his enemy Florentius had been crushed by the fall of a gallery of his house. Benedict, far from rejoicing, wept for the fate of his adversary, and imposed a severe penance on Maurus for an expression of triumph at the judgment that had overtaken their enemy.

Paganism was not yet so completely banished from Italy but that there existed in some of the solitary places, temples and priests and worshippers of the false gods. Indeed, the name Paganism is derived from the word *pagus*, a village, the country people being always more tenacious of national beliefs and customs than the inhabitants of cities. Such a nest of idolaters existed not far from Rome in a consecrated grove; near the summit of Monte Casino stood a temple of Apollo, where the god was still paid unholy rites. Benedict had heard of this abomination; he repaired therefore to the neighborhood of the mountain; he preached the kingdom of Christ to those deluded people, converted them by his eloquence and his miracles, and at last persuaded them to break the idols, throw down the altar, and burn up their consecrated grove. And on the spot he built two chapels, in honor of two saints, whom he regarded as models, the one of the contemplative, the other of the active religious life,—St. John the Baptist, and St. Martin of Tours. Then, higher up the summit of the mountain, he laid the foundations of that celebrated monastery which has since been regarded as the parent institute of his order. Hence was promulgated that famous rule, which became from that

time forth the general law of the monks of Western Europe, and which gave to monachism its definite form.

The rule given to the cenobites of the East comprised the three vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. To these Benedict added two other obligations: the first was manual labor, which was indeed enjoined in the former institution, but less systematically: those who entered his community were obliged to work with their hands seven hours in the day; secondly, the vows were perpetual, but he ordained that these perpetual vows should be preceded by a novitiate of a year: during which the entire code was read repeatedly from beginning to end, and at the conclusion the reader said, in an emphatic voice, "This is the law under which thou art to live and to strive for salvation; if thou canst observe it, enter; if thou canst not, go in peace, thou art free." The vows once taken were irrevocable, and punishment for breaking them was most severe; but the rule is recognized as humane, moderate, wise, and eminently Christian in spirit.

Toward the close of his long life, Benedict was consoled for many troubles by the arrival of his sister Scholastica, who had already devoted herself to a religious life, and now took up her residence in a retired cell about a league and a half from the convent. Very little is known of Scholastica, except that she emulated her brother's piety and self-denial, and although it is not said that she took any vows, she is generally considered as the first Benedictine nun. When she followed her brother to Monte Casino, she drew around her there a small community of pious women, but nothing more is recorded of her except that he used to visit her once a year. On one occasion, when they had been conversing together on spiritual matters till rather late in the evening, Benedict rose to depart; his sister entreated him to remain a little longer, but he refused; she then, bending her head over her clasped hands, prayed that Heaven would interfere and render it impossible for her brother to leave her. Immediately there came on such a furious tempest of thunder, rain, and lightning, that Benedict was obliged to delay his departure for some hours. "God forgive you, sister," said he, "what have you done?" "I asked you to stay, and you would not grant my prayer," she replied. "I asked my God, and He has heard me." As soon as the storm was over he took leave of his sister and returned to the monastery. It was a last meeting. Saint Scholastica died two days afterwards, and Benedict, as he was praying in his cell, beheld the soul of his sister ascending to heaven in the form of a dove.

In the year 540 Benedict was visited by Totila, King of the Goths, who cast himself prostrate at his feet and entreated his blessing. The Saint reproved him for the ravages he had committed in Italy,



and it was remarked that thereafter the ferocious barbarian showed more humanity. Shortly after this visit, Benedict died of a fever, with which he had been seized in attending the poor of the neighborhood. On the sixth day of his illness he ordered his grave to be dug, stood for a while on the edge of it, supported by his disciples, contemplating in silence his narrow bed; then desiring them to carry him to the foot of the altar in the church, he received the last sacraments, and died on the 21st March, 543. Even before his death, institutions of his order were found in every part of Christian Europe. Of his two most beloved disciples, St. Maur carried the foundation into France, and established many monasteries, St. Placidus into Sicily; the first died in his bed; the second is said to have been martyred by certain pirates, in company with his young sister Flavia and thirty companions.

Such is a brief sketch of the life and death of Benedict, condensed from the beautiful "Dialogues" of St. Gregory the Great. When visiting Monte Casino last summer, it was our privilege to witness members of his order renewing the beautiful paintings which depict the striking events in his life, and the most striking of all, his precious and wonderful death, in the very spot where it came to pass; and Young's lines revived in our memory:

"The chamber where the good man meets his fate,  
Is privileged beyond the common walk  
Of virtuous life, quite in the verge of heaven."

Before presenting the claims of Benedict and of the monks on the remembrance and gratitude of Christendom, we may be allowed to inquire into the principles that underlie their manner of life, and attempt a brief apology, in the native sense of the word, of the religious profession.

Every man of intelligence at times tires of the perpetual domination of the flesh over the soul, becomes disgusted with material pursuits and enjoyment, and longs for spiritual good and beauty. It is a reminiscence, perhaps it may be an unconscious one, of the original justice in which God created man. This taste working its legitimate results produces the monk. He falls in love with his soul and with Him whose image the soul is, and turning from perverted humanity contemplates the reflection of the uncreated beauty in nature and attempts to idealize it in art. It is well that Providence always raises up such men to make the rest remember their origin, and the high standard which God had in view when he made us. Were it not for their example we might sink further and further into things of mere sense, and become "like the horse and mule, that have no understanding." Hence, men have always recognized and honored the priesthood, and especially the monks, who

were monks indeed, have offered to support them, even that they might continue to set an example of holiness undisturbed by worldly cares, and might make intercession for the community. Some have tried to call this superstition; why, then, superstition is but another name for truth! What all men, even the most uncultivated, naturally hold, can only proceed from eternal truth evidencing itself to the soul. The monks especially set about perfection, that is, the re-establishment of the dominion of reason and grace over passion and temptation. Our Saviour counselled his followers to strive after perfection, at the same time implying that all do not take the suggestion. It stands to reason, however, that there must always be those who shall be able with His grace to follow those counsels, which certainly were not given in vain. Monks are men who make it the business of their lives to reach that ideal which our Saviour proclaimed. The rule of life laid down by Benedict, arranged all their relations and employments to attain this end. Bossuet says: "It is an epitome of Christianity, a learned and mysterious abridgment of all the doctrines of the Gospel, all the institutions of the Holy Fathers, and all the counsels of perfection. Here prudence and simplicity, humility and courage, severity and gentleness, freedom and dependence, eminently appear. Here correction has all its firmness, condescension all its charm, command all its vigor, and subjection all its repose; silence its gravity, and words their grace; strength its exercise, and weakness its support." Hence the number of saints and eminent men, not reaching that degree, whom it produced; hence its attraction for the noblest minds and most elevated souls; hence its conquests of barbarism and establishment of religion, liberty, and learning wherever it took root.

Wordsworth was a great admirer of the monks, and recalls their qualities in his beautiful poems. We cite a line or two:

"Record we too, with just and faithful pen,  
That many hooded cenobites there are  
Who in their private cells have yet a care  
Of public quiet; unambitious men,  
Counsellors for the world, of piercing ken;  
Whose fervent exhortations from afar  
Move princes to their duty, peace, or war;  
And oftimes in the most forbidding den  
Of solitude, with love of science strong,  
How patiently the yoke of thought they bear;  
By such examples moved to unbought pains,  
The people work like congregated bees;  
Eager to build the quiet fortresses  
Where piety, as they believe, obtains  
From heaven a general blessing; timely rains  
And sunshine; prosperous enterprise, peace, and equity."

The three counsels, as distinct from commandments, recognized in the Gospel and illustrated by the lives of our Lord and His

Apostles, are poverty, chastity, and obedience. These three are essential to monachism. Let us speak first of chastity, that is, pure chastity or virginity. This has always been recognized by the Church as a higher state than the married one, and the constant teaching was expressed in dogmatic form by the Council of Trent.

"Marriage is good," says St. Chrysostom, "but virginity as far excels it as angels men, but all the excellency of this is derived from the consecration of a soul to God and her attention to please Him, without which this state avails nothing." "Silver is good," says St. Jerome, "but gold is better. I do not disparage silver because I say that gold is better; neither do I deny the excellence of marriage when I maintain that virginity is a higher state."

Lord Bacon, in one of his essays, thus expresses his opinion as regards those in society whose life should be devoted to the common service in spirituals :

"A single life," he says, "doth well with churchmen, for charity will hardly water the ground where it must first fill a pool." Thorn-dyke, an eminent Protestant divine, in his book on *Just Weights and Measures*, p. 239, says : "The reason for single life for the clergy is firmly grounded, by the fathers and canons of the Church, upon the precept of St. Paul, forbidding man and wife to depart unless for a time to attend unto prayer (1 Cor. vii. 5). For priests and deacons, being continually to attend upon occasions of celebrating the Eucharist, which ought continually to be frequented; if others be to abstain for a time, then they always."

If one might be allowed to theorize a little on this subject, a professional man must be married to his books if he will attain excellence in his mental calling. Indeed, his habits of meditation and study incapacitate him, as physiologists give us to understand, for the offices of paternity. Besides this, he is divided if he marry, and his children, if he have them, will scarcely be equal to the average, while his single-minded and single-hearted devotion to his calling is interfered with. Great intellectual men and others of singular ability in other ways, are very often the last representatives of their families. There is a popular saying about preachers' sons, to which it boots not more particularly to allude, but which is akin to that one about the foot-covering of the shoemaker's wife. As for having wives in a monastery, it would simply mean suicide for the institution.

The nerve, as the Italians call it, the strength, physical at least, of a nation, resides in its middle class, and in what may be called without offence a lower one, the mechanical and agricultural. They who rise out of this by more highly developed intellect and will, exalt the mind and soul at the expense of the body. Bodily labor as a normal occupation interferes with the highest mental develop-



ment, and this with perfection of the material part. Hence the rich and educated resemble the flower of the fields, which dies and disappears forever; the populace may be compared to the trunk and roots, which show less, but remain through the seasons. The most ancient families in England are not found in what is called the peerage, which constantly requires fresh accessions from below, and out of several hundred families in it, not seventy were found there at the beginning of the last century. Illustrious men, too, seem generally to have reached the climax of their race, and leave no issue or a weak decayed shoot. For this reason there would be slight hope of benefit from the marriage of priests. Man's race as a race will not stand high education. The individual must receive it to keep the lamp of science, religion, and civilization burning, but he feeds this with his own blood, and the race must either forego his services, or be content to accept his death as the price paid for them, and look to others for the office of perpetuating the species.

Whatever may be said about this theory, it is certain that the physicians of the University of Paris, even after the Middle Ages, still professed celibacy; the clerks of the counting-houses of the Hanse-towns were also bound to it; it is universal in the vast standing armies of Europe, and recognized as desirable even in our own limited force. Besides which a great number of men and women of every religious faith are as Paul was, except the bonds, and fill worthily public and private positions, claiming for themselves that freedom which they willingly allow to others. If they are so from a good motive, not indolence or misanthropy, much more if they are so that they may cultivate their own souls in single-life, believing this to be God's will in their regard, and that they may more fearlessly and wholly serve their neighbor in hospitals, schools, asylums, and armies, they are deserving of great honor and praise. Such are the monks by their profession. It is the glory of the Church that, while recommending her chosen ones to "leave all things" and "seek the kingdom of God and his justice" only, she has provided fathers and mothers for the orphans, the helpless, and the poor, who are "always with us," preservers of the truth, devotees of science, munificent patrons of art, masters in agriculture, heralds of the Gospel, founders of great nations, pioneers and guardians of civilization, and all this without saddling society with the most odious of all castes, a sacerdotal one. The more one considers this doctrine of sacred celibacy and its results, the stronger will grow the conviction that it is a divine provision for remedying the evils incidental to that freedom of the marriage relation and the generation of children by those who, from what cause soever

are incapable of caring for and educating them, which human legislation has found it impossible to regulate.

That he may devote himself to the general good it is necessary that the preacher, the hospitaller, the teacher, the soldier, should be free from the cares of self-maintenance. This is attained by those who form communities. As to individual poverty, we have the example of our Saviour, who, with his disciples, lived on what was donated them; and the proverb has it, "No one acts the soldier at his own expense." When the young man told Christ that he had always kept the commandments, the reply was: "If thou wouldst be perfect (he left him free), go sell all thou hast and give to the poor, and come, follow me." The youth was sad at this, because he had large possessions. It is a sign of great nobility of character to be detached from the goods of this world. In a community of monks, as in an army or any other institution, poverty, that is absence of private ownership, or at least of administration of one's property, is essential to brotherliness, equality, and unity. Nothing divides men so rapidly and completely as money and its use. They who would dwell and work together as brethren in one house must have the same food, dress, and lodging. Simplicity in all these things is also necessary, for intemperance is the parent of lust, and the cause of nearly all diseases and disorders which do not spring from lust. Hence the domestic discipline of the monks was more or less severe in all that regards personal needs. They rose early, slept just enough, lay on hard couches, and practiced continual abstinence from unnecessary viands. Meanwhile, by their regularity, peace of mind, and the manual labor in which every one from the abbot, who, as a writer has it, "returned home like Cincinnatus with his scythe upon his shoulder," down to him who took care of the lamps, even the professors were obliged to take part, they gained that healthy appetite which is the best sauce for plain natural food. Health, therefore, and good spirits were dominant amongst them, the term "jolly monks" became a proverb, and they attained by mortification what we all desire,—a healthy mind in a sound body, and their days were long in the land. All the while that they thus curtailed their own wants, their system and constant labor was accumulating means, wherewith they helped the poor victims of the vices contrary to their own practice.

Obedience is the third chief characteristic of the monk. Its necessity in every house, city, and state, need not be dwelt upon. The freest political institutions depend for their permanence on the obedience of the members to the law and its executive. The only liberty we have in our republic is to choose whom we must obey. The monks bound themselves to obey the abbot in all that was not evidently contrary to God's law. He had to govern accord-

ing to the rule, which they knew well before binding themselves, being on probation for a year before admission, and which was approved by the Church authorities. Besides, in any important matter the abbot had to consult a general council of all the members, and he was chosen by the monks themselves, and thus, like the president of a pure democracy, was the servant, not the lord of his subjects.

Obedience is the highest merit and praise of the soldier, and of the citizen, whose most noble epithet is law-abiding. There is nothing so popular as military glory, because it involves the sacrifice of self. "To subdue self is the secret of strength," says De Tocqueville. The monks were often styled soldiers, for that their whole life was a heroic warfare against corrupt human passion and its results. Some of them formed companies for fleshly battle as well as spiritual, and after contending against the heathen as Knights Templars or of St. John, doffed the cuirass and sang their office in choir, or tended the wounded in hospital. One of the vows of these monkish warriors forbade them to turn their backs on less than five opponents, and how well they kept it history can tell. Schiller's beautiful lines, rendered in our tongue by Bulwer Lytton, express their praise :

"Oh nobly shone the fearful Cross upon your mail afar,  
When Rhodes and Acre hailed your might, O lions of the war!  
When leading many a pilgrim horde through wastes of Syrian gloom,  
Or standing with the Cherub's sword before the Holy Tomb.  
Yet on your forms the apron seemed a nobler armor far,  
When by the sick man's bed ye stood, O lions of the war!  
When ye, the highborn, bowed your pride to tend the lowly weakness—  
The duty, though it brought no fame, fulfilled by Christian meekness—  
Religion of the Cross—thou blend'st, as in a single flower,  
The twofold branches of the palm,—HUMILITY AND POWER."

Truly is here the Scripture verified: "The obedient man shall have victories to talk of."

The practice of these virtues gave the monks a singular and powerful position in society. They became the trusted almoners of the rich, for they spent nothing on themselves. Their education and the noble birth of many of them made them equal to the aristocracy, while they levelled society up by admitting alike serf, peasant, and noble, under equal conditions, into their ranks. Their simple lives and the sacred character which many of them bore as priests made them accessible to the poor, who could hardly complain of their lot when they received alms and hospitality from those who were admittedly their superiors, yet led a harder life than they did themselves. Here lies the secret, possessed by the Church alone, of making the poor content, and bridging over the chasms of society.



Let us glance once more at the internal side of monasticism, and hear St. Bernard, translated by Wordsworth, in its praise :

“Here man more purely lives, less oft doth fall;  
More promptly rises; walks with nicer tread;  
More safely rests; dies happier; is freed  
Earlier from cleansing fires, and gains withal  
A brighter crown.”

“There is,” says Jameson, “a view of the sanctity of solitude, placed before us in the earlier monastic pictures, which is soothing and attractive far beyond the power of words. How beautiful that soft, settled calm, which seems to have descended on the features, as on the souls of those who have kept themselves unspotted from the world! How dear to the fatigued or wounded spirit that blessed portraiture of stillness with communion, of seclusion with sympathy, which breathes from such picture! Who at some moments has not felt their unspeakable charm? Felt, when the weight of existence pressed on the fevered nerves and weary heart, the need of some refuge for life on this side of death, and all the real or at least the possible sanctity of solitude.”

Sir James Stephen thus alludes to the perfection of the individual as attained in the monasteries :

“The greatness of the Benedictines did not, however, consist either in their agricultural skill, their prodigies of architecture, or their priceless libraries, but in their parentage of countless men and women illustrious for active piety, for wisdom in the government of mankind, for profound learning, and for that contemplative spirit which discovers, within the soul itself, things beyond the limits of the perceptible creation.”

These encomiums are very commonly met with in historical writers. The same author thus speaks of the mendicant orders of monks :

“In an age of oligarchal tyranny the mendicant friars were the protectors of the weak, in an age of ignorance the instructors of mankind, and in an age of profligacy the stern vindicators of the holiness of the sacerdotal character and the virtues of domestic life.”

Their whole existence was a protest against lawlessness, violence, and sin. Their continual endeavor was for peace, order, law, and gentleness of manners. Even in their treatment of the brute creation this was illustrated, and their legends are full of the most touching and exquisite incidents of the manner in which the monks made use of these, which the admirable St. Francis of Assisi did not scruple to call his “brothers the wolves” and his “sisters the little birds.” All the gentle virtues flourished within and around the monastery.

"We are outliving," says Mrs. Jameson, "the gross prejudices which once represented the life of the cloister as being from first to last a life of laziness and imposture; we know that, but for the monks, the light of liberty, and literature, and science had been forever extinguished; and that, for six centuries, there existed for the thoughtful, the gentle, the inquiring, the devout spirit, no peace, no security, no home but the cloister. There learning trimmed her lamp; there contemplation pruned her wings; there the traditions of art, preserved from age to age by lonely, studious men, kept alive, in form and color, the ideal of a beauty beyond that of earth, of a might beyond that of the spear and the shield, of a divine sympathy with suffering humanity. To this we may add another and a stronger claim on our respect and moral sympathies. The protection and the better education given to women in these early communities; the venerable and distinguished rank assigned them when as governesses of their order they became in a manner dignitaries of the Church; the introduction of their beautiful and saintly effigies, clothed with all the insignia of sanctity and authority, into the decoration of places of worship and books of devotion, did more perhaps for the general cause of womanhood than all the boasted institutions of chivalry."

Indeed, it was from the recognition of woman's proper sphere and dignity by the Church and her clergy, by their regard for her who was of Mary's sex, and which they preached and inculcated, that those warlike knights learned their somewhat excessive reverence for the weaker but yet noble complement of man, and if one would seek the highest examples of virtue, learning, executive ability, and usefulness among the sex, he must fain turn to the chronicles of monasticism, as well in the remote as in the more recent history of the Church. Let us but name Mary of Egypt, Thais, Pelagia the Pearl of Antioch, Paula, Melita, Walburga of England, Colette of France, Odilia, and coming down to later times Clare of Assisi, Angela and Teresa, not to mention the illustrious women who founded those modern orders of charity which the whole undivided world praises. Their number is so great, their lives and works so edifying and useful, that they reflect lustre on the religious institution which they chose to embrace. The same argument may be applied to monasticism which holds for religion in general. It is in its essence good and beautiful, and therefore true, because it attracts those who seek for the good, the beautiful, and the true, or because it produces in those who submit to its influence a character in which all men may recognize those three essential characteristics of perfection.

A very natural connection leads us now to speak in detail of the external influence of the monks, that is, apart from the living

force of their example, which caused their numbers to swell incredibly, and their institution to spread into every Christian land. Great deeds arise from quiet, regular, mortified lives. He who has long meditated feels an irresistible impulse to impart to others the light he has received. He who has been long under obedience is likely to develop and show forth the most brilliant qualities as a commander. We may illustrate our meaning by an argument *ad hominem*. There are those who consider the protest of the sixteenth century a great benefit to society and to civilization. They owe it to a monk, one who abandoned his profession it is true, but yet were he not a monk it is very probable he would not have become the enthusiastic leader of revolution. Human nature is restive under discipline, and the longer the waters are restrained the higher they mount, and the more desperate is their flow. Man is essentially prone to action, and the fuller he becomes of knowledge the more zealous he is to impart it. Hence the army is drilled and practiced every day in order that it may become more desirous of putting its skill to practical use, and the more severe is the garrison duty the more the soldiers long to try their lances in real combat. Hence the monks have been, as a rule, the most prolific writers, the greatest preachers and energetic missionaries, for that they were allowed to speak but rarely, were compelled to study constantly, and to keep the narrow limits of their cells. Another feature in their discipline accounts for the completeness and perfection of their works. This was the setting every individual to that work for which he had most talent and inclination. Progress may be said in a sense to lie in the line of least resistance. "This one thing I do," said a successful man. Now each monk did what his ability inclined to, did this only, and therefore became a specialist, a perfect workman. Herein, apart from the high motive of duty and the protection given by a rule, lies the secret of the shining qualities and brilliant deeds of monks as compared with the secular clergy, who, to use a homely expression, are obliged in their less fortunate but honorable and necessary calling to turn their hands to everything, to be jacks at all trades, rarely masters of any.

---



## ENGLAND'S RETURN TO THE FAITH.

WHEN, in February, 1846, John Henry Newman and a few attached followers quitted their ascetic home at Littlemore, near Oxford, and went forth not knowing whither they went, it may be said that England's return to the faith fairly began. Others, it is true, had gone before them, and among them Ambrose Lisle Phillipps, Ignatius Spencer, and Kenelm Digby, but they were not many, and none had a tithe of the influence—the mighty meekness of wisdom—that belonged to the ex-Vicar of St. Mary the Virgin. Many clergymen and laymen throughout the country immediately flung down their arms of rebellion against the Church, and submitted to be taught by her at whose feet their master and teacher was then sitting. To some this exit was the loss of all things, but they were able to say, "Let us also go and die with him." They believed it to be following Christ, whether it were for life or death. They had in their hands Newman's *Essay on the Theory of Development*, and it contained the reasons which had influenced their beloved leader, drawn out elaborately with a force and persuasiveness which no other writer on such subjects could rival or imitate. Anglican clergymen in the remote parishes were startled and amazed at the self-sacrifice of a man who might have led the Church of England, or a large portion of it, whither he would, and so have made himself an everlasting name. Some, though they still retained their benefices, from that moment felt their position insecure. If he who has raised rampart after rampart in defence of Anglicanism now abandoned his fortifications as untenable, what could be effected by feebler and less skilful resistance? If Troy, they whispered, could have been saved, it was by his right hand. Dr. Pusey, though in the language of tender and affectionate friendship, strove to attenuate the force and significance of the extraordinary event, and critics less amiable pretended, with righteous horror, to find labels of "*Poison*" in the heading of one chapter in the *Theory of Development* which spoke of the deification of the saints.<sup>1</sup>

Bishops, deans, and archdeacons, having hounded Newman with all their might out of the Church of England, now bitterly reviled him for having taken them at their word, and while they professed hypocritically to be rejoiced at being rid of a traitor in the camp, felt keenly that the brightest star which had ever shone in their horizon could no longer be seen in dazzling splendor in their midst.

<sup>1</sup> The word has been altered in later editions.

The Professor of Poetry, at Oxford, has lately given it as his opinion—one of no mean weight—that no prose-poetry that Newman has produced equals that of his eight volumes of *Parochial Sermons*, delivered at St. Mary's in Oxford.<sup>1</sup> The simplicity of these familiar but most thoughtful addresses places them, he thinks, above the higher toned and more elaborate oratory of the "Discourses Addressed to Mixed Congregations." Such sermons were to be heard no more by his parishioners, and never more was he to thrill with the enchantment of his musical voice the Dons, and Masters, and Bachelors of Arts assembled in the University church. "The secession of Dr. Newman," Lord Beaconsfield has written, "dealt a blow to the Church of England under which it still reels."<sup>2</sup>

Multitudes of conversions followed that of the chief Tractarian. His writings, also, "Loss and Gain," and others, told with marvellous effect on the public mind. There was scarcely a well-known family but saw one or more of its members enlist in the army of Rome. Clergymen, barristers, nobles, officers, publishers, architects, literati of every description, reviewers, naturalists, the owners of broad lands and the heirs of great fortunes. First-class men and wranglers, physicians, poets, Protestant sisterhoods, sculptors, painters, professors, members of Parliament, justices of the peace, musicians, royal academicians, merchants, editors, fellows of colleges, dramatists, government officials, and, in short, representatives of every branch of society were drawn in a continuous stream, which has not yet ceased to flow, by different but converging channels to the great centre,—Rome.

Of these converts most of them published something, a book, a pamphlet, or at least a tract, explaining the reasons which induced them to do, what men in general do with the utmost reluctance,—change their religion. The change, moreover, in this case, was the more remarkable because it ran directly counter to the national prejudices and traditions during three hundred years. To a vast number of persons it appeared simple insanity, equally at variance with Scripture, reason, and common sense. It was regarded, too, as an outrage on social duties and proprieties, and it led, in a great many cases, to husbands and wives separating, children being disinherited, the dearest, the most cheerful and winning inmates of happy and united homes being thrust out at the gates, friendless, homeless, pennyless, and sometimes, but for the consolations of their religion, broken-hearted. Many, deprived of their profession and means of subsistence, were compelled to begin life anew under terrible disadvantages. Many had to go down in the scale of society, and submit to find themselves in surroundings alien to their

<sup>1</sup> Shairp's Lectures on the Aspects of Poetry. Cardinal Newman. 1881.

<sup>2</sup> Preface to *Lothair*, p. xv.

habits and distasteful to their feelings. Others experienced bitter reproaches, mocks and taunts, insults and injuries, at the hands of those who had once been their kindest friends. But all these trials of faith, not the less severe because they were borne for the most part in silence and secret, were in themselves sermons,—they spoke, in language more forcible than any words could have spoken, of a strength of inward conviction and a joy-inspiring sense of inward realities, which it would be difficult for anything but divine truth to impart. The conversions were often effected without any personal influence having been used, a Catholic priest ever having been spoken to, a Catholic Church ever having been entered. The conviction seemed to come straight from above: "There must be a church in which the living gospel of Christ is preserved intact from age to age, and that one of which St. Peter's successor is the head must be the Church in question. England has forsaken the fountain of living waters, and hewn out for herself broken cisterns that hold no water. She must return." The most ardent patriotism burned in the hearts of the converts, and their feelings resembled those of the Pagans in the first ages, who at the preaching of Apostles and missionaries cast away their idols and took up the cross to follow the Crucified. To none was the change more trying than to Protestant clergymen who, with the purest intentions, had accepted a pastoral office and conscientiously endeavored to discharge its duties. It rent their very heart-strings asunder to sever themselves from their parsonages and flocks, divest themselves of a sacerdotal and even of a ministerial character, appear, to the horror and disgust of their friends and bewilderment of their parishioners, as laymen, and begin an untried and totally different course of life. The teachers had to become learners; the first had to be last; the humiliation was complete. But this was their abundant solace,—the tide of England's return to the faith had fairly set in.

Many things, of course, had conspired to ameliorate the condition of Catholics since the time of the Elizabethan persecution. James the First somewhat relaxed the penal laws or held them in abeyance. Charles the First married a Catholic princess; Charles the Second embraced the Catholic religion on his death-bed. James the Second openly professed the faith, and not a few of his subjects, including Dryden, gave in their adhesion to Catholicity, and educated their children in Catholic principles. William the Third was not disposed to persecute. In Queen Anne's time Catholics, unless they were turbulent, might lead a tolerably quiet life, and even mix in general society, as did Alexander Pope. Under the first three Georges they were more neglected than molested; under the Fourth of that name, the Test and Corporation Acts were repealed in 1828, and in the following year the Roman Catholic Re-



lief Bill entirely altered their political, and greatly modified their social, position. Charles Butler, Plowden and Lingard, the author of *England's Reformation*; Bishops Milner, Challoner, and Hay; Drs. Wiseman and Rock, did them honor as men of letters; but though on many accounts they lifted up their heads, they could scarcely feel as yet that their redemption was drawing nigh. They continued for years to be in England a part of the population little known and less cared for. Their books were unread out of their own limited circle; their manor-houses and castles were looked upon as dark and mysterious abodes of antiquated and superstitious people; their poor were squalid and un-English; their chapels were far apart, obscure, and mean. Their usual lot was to be set aside, feared, maligned, misinterpreted; they rarely made a convert, and few of them ever dared to indulge a hope of "England's Return." It was a common practice to keep the Blessed Sacrament itself in a *cupboard* in the vestry, without even a light, and never having an act of adoration paid to it, except at Mass.<sup>1</sup>

Among the few English converts of mark who had preceded Newman, one, who has already been mentioned, passed into the Church in the year following the admission of Catholics to seats in Parliament. This was the Honorable and Reverend George Spencer, afterwards Father Ignatius of St. Paul, Passionist. From an early period of his career as a Catholic priest his mind became deeply impressed by one idea,—the efficacy and necessity of prayer for the conversion of England. He was penetrated more than most men by the conviction of the value and power of personal and individual prayer, but he felt still more deeply persuaded of the wonderful and ever-blessed results of united intercessions. No object appeared to him more worthy of prayer than the conversion of his native land from heresy and schism to the true faith, and towards this very desirable end he directed the most ardent and persistent efforts of his life. He was sure that prayer would succeed, that difficulties which appeared insuperable would vanish before it, that the rough places would be made smooth, the mountains cast into the sea, and the way of the Lord prepared. He met with abundant encouragement. The circle of his co-petitioners constantly widened. In France, Rome, Ireland, Belgium, and Holland, prayerful wrestlers stepped daily into the sacred arena. Of all countries on earth England would be the most difficult to recover. She had in every generation during three centuries renewed and persisted in formal acts of apostasy. Every sovereign, and every official, had for a long period been constrained to denounce Catholicity as superstitious and idolatrous. Could any adequate reparation be offered for such persistent blasphemy,

---

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Wiseman to F. Spencer. Ash Wednesday, 1839.

wrought into the very texture of the laws, and built into the framework of society? It affected the entire national literature, corrupted the habits of the people, vitiated the course of education, and the statutes of universities. How were the coils of this gigantic serpent to be loosened? How were the chains of which the slaves of prejudice boasted to be struck off? To these questions Father Spencer and Dr. Wiseman had an unhesitating answer: "By sacrifice and prayer." "I am going, in a day or two," wrote the latter from Rome in 1839, "to concert with Pallotta the best means of propagating the devotion, both in communities and among the people."

The answers and the prayers of faith were not slow in arriving. In 1842 and 1843 conversions multiplied daily, and during the three years following the public papers were constantly recording new defections from the Church of Cranmer and Queen Elizabeth. In the beginning of 1846 Father Ignatius wrote that one day in Oscott twelve ex-clergymen of the Establishment assisted at his Mass, and "there were three more who might have been there, but were unable to come."<sup>1</sup> Of such clerical converts the writer has known personally more than a hundred, and the names of three times as many have been written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Father Ignatius Spencer did an incalculable service to his country by making a new departure in the Catholic movement in England spring from prayer, and it will be well if the zeal which he excited in this direction, and in this exercise, know no abatement until the whole number of the elect be gathered in, and all England, so far as this be possible, shall be saved. The multitude of emigrant priests who took refuge in England during the storms of the first French revolution, though scattered about in the hospitable houses of the rich and great, left little or no mark upon the religion of the country. Their influence had not been supported and aided by prayers such as Ignatius Spencer had caused to batter loudly against the gates of heaven. But now that heaven had been besieged by thousands of importunate supplicants, eager for the conversion of their friends and neighbors, the Crimean War brought France and England into friendly alliance, and our people learned to travel in that and other Catholic countries of Europe with their eyes open to the splendors and charms of foreign ritual, and their ears unsealed to the persuasive voices of Catholic explanations. Religious sisterhoods, such as our officers and soldiers had admired in active operation in the tents and trenches of the blood-stained battle-plains, became speedily multiplied nearer home, and the tender hands of many a high-born girl, in the simple garb of a sister of St. Vincent of Paul, ministered to the wants of poor,

<sup>1</sup> Life of Father Ignatius of St. Paul, p. 343.

sick, and dying in the crowded courts and unwholesome alleys of densely populated cities and towns. Forces of which a former generation had never dreamed were called into play, and proved as efficacious in the spiritual world as steam and electricity were in the material. Multitudes of preachers went everywhere in the name of the Lord; babes and sucklings seemed to be charged with messages from on high; athletes innumerable were ready to do battle for the Christ, and prove that England had driven Him, her Saviour and her God, from altar and hearth. The process, destined to be long and difficult, of disillusioning the public mind of the falsehoods of ages was begun and extending widely with manifest success. The lies, too long current though gross, of popular historians, the misrepresentations of Protestant preachers and divines, and the inventions and calumnies of unscrupulous travellers, were exposed, and it was demonstrated in a thousand ways that Rome had never denied the vital truths she was said to contradict, and never affirmed the diabolical falsehoods she was said to hold. Protestantism, even that of the Church of England, appealed to some principles only of our nature; it was discovered by degrees that Catholicity appealed to them all. The nimbus of glory which, in the eyes of the masses, had surrounded the brows of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, vanished into thick darkness, and Anglican clergymen were heard to apply to them epithets as severe as had ever issued from the lips of Catholic victims of reforming oppressors. One of these, the Reverend Dr. Littledale, writing in 1868, said: "I gravely assert it to be absolutely impossible for any just, educated, and religious men, who have read the history of the time in genuine sources, to hold two opinions about the reformers. They were such utterly unredeemed villains, for the most part, that the only parallel I know of for the way in which half-educated people speak of them amongst us, is the appearance of Pontius Pilate among the saints in the Abyssinian Kalendar."<sup>1</sup>

Father Ignatius Spencer was indefatigable in provoking not Catholics only, but Anglicans and dissenters also, to prayers for unity in the truth "wherever God sees it to be;" and he would probably have regarded it as an answer to such prayer that Catholic doctrines and ritual have penetrated the mass of Anglicans in so many directions, that the Low Church or Evangelical party, once dominant, has long been in a minority, and the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, as taught by the Catholic religion, finds more and more acceptance among High Church clergymen, and is openly taught and represented at their altars by the nearest approaches they can effect to the solemn and sometimes gorgious

---

<sup>1</sup> Letter in the *Guardian*, 16th May, 1868.



ritual of the Mass. Where the zealous Passionist effected nothing more, he, at all events, succeeded in diminishing the spirit of acrimony and the disposition in people of opposite principles to misrepresent one another's views. One day, in February, 1850, he called on the Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, by whom he was received with much politeness, and told: "I consider the body to which you belong as the one which suffers the most from misrepresentations."<sup>1</sup> In calling upon Lord Clarendon, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, at Dublin Castle, in February, 1852, Father Spencer explained to him how earnestly he was endeavoring to induce the Irish to pray for England. If they had persevered in such prayer, to which he had over and over again exhorted them, "they would not," in his opinion, "have thought of making pikes against England in 1848." Lord Clarendon was pleased with his visit, and though his lordship's Protestantism probably continued as stout in texture as before, he highly approved of the good father's mode of procedure, from his point of view, and said: "If every one acted as you do, we should have nothing to complain of." Father Spencer, who may fairly be called the apostle of prayer for England's return to the faith, had an interview with Lord Palmerston, then secretary for foreign affairs, and a communication with Lord Derby in 1851, both of which tended to promote kindly feelings, if they failed of any higher result.

To one who considers the present position of the Church in England, and compares it with that which obtained when Newman cast in his lot with it, and when Father Spencer recommended it so earnestly to the prayers of the faithful, there are two things which force themselves strongly on the mind,—first, the great increase in the number and influence of Catholics during the last forty years, and, secondly, the inconsiderable proportion which that number and influence still bear when contrasted with that of the non-Catholics who make up the rest of the population. The Catholic Directory published in London every year shows, during the forty-five years that it has appeared, a steady increase in the number of its priests, prelates, churches and chapels, colleges, schools, convents, institutions, societies, English confessors abroad, peers, baronets, members of the Privy Council. The Dioceses are becoming gradually enriched by asylums for aged poor, homes for servants, hospitals, refuges, industrial schools, reformatory schools, orphanages, shoe-black brigades, homes for cripples, sisters of charity, and other institutions equally benevolent in their object and pious in the way they are conducted. Religious houses are constantly becoming more numerous, and extending their bounds

---

<sup>1</sup> Life of Father Ignatius of St. Paul, p. 404.

and spheres of action. The colleges are remarkable for the increase in the learning and ability of the professors, and in the proficiency of the pupils. These are prepared in the colleges, such as Stonyhurst, Ushaw, and Oscott, for examinations which they may have to undergo in London or elsewhere, for the civil service, or the University of London, and the necessity of attaining a high mark of excellence for this purpose, has led to a much more strict scientific, mathematical, classical, and literary training than was formerly required. The space that separates church from church, and chapel from chapel, decreases fast; and country-seats with resident chaplains, and altars, and Masses of their own, become nearer to one another. The sweet and exquisitely plaintive notes of Catholic choirs and organs rise from more numerous buildings, and the houses of prayer are more impressive in their architecture, richer in their decoration, and more orderly and, it may be even magnificent, in their appointments. Catholics, again, fill more important offices in the state, the army, navy, and government departments; they fall under less suspicion in consequence of their faith; they are trusted, like their neighbors, as men of honor and intelligence; they mix in general society; they are not dreaded as they used to be; they are largely employed on the public press; and, as a rule, they are found incapable of taking dishonorable advantage of any intimacy that may be allowed them. In fact the national prejudices are modified though far from extinct. There is no knowing how soon some members of the royal family may, in spite of the prohibitions of law, make their submission to the Catholic Church; and if they were to do so, there is very little reason to think that it would cause any popular commotion, or prove anything more than a nine days' wonder.

But though these and a thousand other signs of the extension of Catholicity among the people exist, it must not be forgotten that the population also has greatly augmented, and that we are surrounded on every side by unreconciled, powerful, watchful foes. Nor do they fight under one flag. The anti-Catholic army of England is composed of many allies, united only in hostility to the ancient faith. The Anglican Church is the established religion of the land, and Mr. Bright himself has said that there is little chance at present of the majority of the people wishing it to be otherwise. Its clergy are for the most part men of education, respectability, and zeal, and the better portion of their parishioners are attached to them as pastors. The Dissenters, principally Independents, Methodists, and Baptists, are further removed from Catholic doctrine than the Anglicans, and more hostile to it because more ignorant of all that concerns it. Yet their ministers are said to be trained in their seminaries with greater care than

formerly, and many of them turn out scholars, authors, and effective preachers. Besides these there is in the anti-Catholic army a strong contingent of freethinkers under different names and often no names at all. There are atheists, theists, deists, agnostics, positivists, materialists, who, though unmeasured in their enmity to Catholicity, have, nevertheless, the candor generally to say that the Church of which the Pope is the head is the only formidable enemy they have to encounter, that her children alone can manfully face a well-instructed infidel, and that her forces alone will long keep the field on the battle-plain of human thought. It is a part of the tactics of these gentlemen to represent Catholics as the particular enemies of progress, civilization, and science, in spite of all that one of their chief leaders, Auguste Comte, has written to the contrary. Yet Professor Huxley tells us how, when he was paying a visit to one of the most important of the institutions in which the clergy of the Catholic Church are trained, he found the professors of the college were permitted to speak frankly with him "as with a friendly foe, and how they instructed their pupils in what they considered the errors of the times, philosophic and scientific, and the attitude which they should assume towards them."<sup>1</sup> But of this we may be perfectly certain that in no Catholic college or university in the land did a single professor seek to inspire a spirit of animosity towards scientific research or clearly ascertained scientific facts. The Church has never been the enemy, but always the friend, of science, art, and literature, and she never can be otherwise than a patroness of all that really favors civilization and progress. To assert the contrary is to betray the grossest ignorance and to overthrow the great facts of her history by some quibbling quotation from some ill-understood passage in the Syllabus. Bishop Clifford has recently given the lie to such preposterous calumnies by his remarks on science in the *Dublin Review*: "The discussion," his lordship says, "of such questions (as that of the Days of Creation) in a scientific Catholic review can give no just cause for alarm. There would be far more reason for alarm if Catholic students and Catholic writers showed apathy or contempt of what are in truth among the burning religious questions of the day. Many of the questions which have agitated the Church in former times, and which still remain of deep interest to theologians, attract but little notice from the present generation of mankind. The wonderful discoveries of modern science, on the other hand, possess an immense fascination for all thoughtful minds, both old and young. The conclusions at which scientific men have arrived, concerning the early stages of our globe and of our race, have un-

---

<sup>1</sup> Huxley's Lay Sermons, 1870, p. 63.



doubtedly the appearance, in more instances than one, of being irreconcilable with what we find recorded in Holy Scripture on these same subjects. These apparent contradictions are a real stumbling-block in the path of many believers, as well as of sincere inquirers after religious truth. It is the office of the apologist to strengthen the faith of the former, *and to aid the researches of the latter.* Difficulties are not removed and faith is not strengthened by a few flippant sneers directed against scientific men, or by a few platitudes about the liability of all men to err. Instead of strengthening the faith of waverers, such treatment disgusts and repels men who have made themselves acquainted in any degree with the conscientious and patient researches on which scientific men ground their facts and theories. The only way in which the apologists of revelation can expect successfully to meet those theories is either by pointing out the fallacies, where fallacies exist, in the arguments of scientific men, or by explaining how it is that the statements of science and of Holy Scripture are not really at variance with each other."<sup>1</sup>

These enlightened sentiments of the Bishop of Clifton are illustrated and confirmed by the writings of Catholic physicists of the present day, such as Professors Mivart, Barff, and Perry, who has followed in the steps of the Roman Jesuit of European reputation, and, as an astronomer, has the confidence of the English government, and was commissioned by them some years ago to observe the transit of Venus from the island of Kerguelen. Professor Barff has approved himself as a chemist of the highest distinction, not only by his admirable work on the subject of chemistry, now commonly in the hands of students, but by his valuable discovery of the method of preserving iron from rust.<sup>2</sup> Dr. Mivart is distinguished as a Christian evolutionist, who, amid all his speculations concerning social, political, scientific, and philosophic evolution, has never committed himself to such an adherence to the views of Darwin on the origin of species as would compromise his character as a Christian teacher, and cause his orthodoxy as a Catholic to be called in question. There is, therefore, not the slightest reason to fear that England's return to the faith will in any degree be hindered by Catholic opposition to science properly so called, and it remains to be seen whether Catholics here will not ultimately do more than keep abreast of non-Catholic and anti-Catholic students of natural history and science. It will never, of course, be their mission, as Catholics, to teach secular knowledge of any kind, but the philosophy of Christianity of which they are possessed may gift them with an insight into nature and the laws of life more

<sup>1</sup> Dublin Review, January, 1882. Bishop Clifford on the Days of Creation, p. 506-7.

<sup>2</sup> Year-Book of Facts in Science and the Arts, 1878, pp. 183-85.

penetrating than that of men who have made the universe itself a God-denying apostate, and changed the language of stars and flowers and strata and all chemical substances from "The Hand that made us is Divine" into "No Hand that made us is Divine; we are our own protoplasm, our own protozoa; we breathed into ourselves the breath of life; there is no God but matter organic and inorganic, and thought itself is one of its functions!"

If, in the presence of powerful and multitudinous adversaries, the hope of England's return sometimes dies down in the heart, how can we revive it better than by contrasting the past with the present and seeing how much ground we have gained, how many fine intellects we have convinced, how many immortal souls we have won? The Catholic Church in England "was for at least two generations without churches or bishops—a handful of priests ministered to a remnant of Catholics, the number of whom at the end of the last century was supposed to amount to thirty thousand."<sup>1</sup> Well, leaving the last century behind, step forward into the present century sixty-two years. Dr. Manning is preaching at the opening of the Church of St. Boniface, in London. He refers to a convert, eighty years of age, who was present, seventy years before, when that very building was first opened as a place of worship for a dissenting sect. Let us listen to the preacher's words, for they are much to the purpose in the present place. "Within the term of one such life," he says, "what events are compressed. One extreme of it rests upon the year when London was tormented and degraded by the No Popery riots, when the infuriated populace streamed through the streets to sack and burn the Catholic churches, when the Catholic bishop was sought for, as St. Boniface by the heathen, to take his life; the other extreme rests upon this day, when the Church comes in all its power and freedom. In the interval what events are to be found? The emancipation and the resurrection of the whole Catholic people of this empire as from the grave, the abolition of penal laws, and their restoration to the social and political life of this English race. Next, the organization of the Catholic hierarchy, with all the exuberant life which goes out of it on every side. Who could then have foreseen such manifestations of the power from on high? And if one life has seen such things, what may not some of you yet live to see? There may be some here to-day who shall be witnesses of a change, which if I were to attempt to describe, you would think me beside myself. There are agencies and powers in full operation, the effects of which as yet are not perceived. But two things are already manifest; the one, that all fragmentary

---

<sup>1</sup> Christianity in Great Britain, "The Church of Rome," 1874, p. 34.

forms of Christianity are falling piecemeal, and resolving themselves into dust. The touch of death has been laid upon them, and they are obeying the law of their own nature. They spring from man, and, as all human things, they contain the principles of their own dissolution. The other, that the Church of God is expanding with a steadfast and majestic advance, multiplying itself on every side, and prevailing over the reason and the hearts of men. The word of God and the Spirit from the ends of the world have entered into England with all the weight and power of an irresistible tide. It is like the encroachments of the sea. And as all antagonists dissolve and pass away, leaving the earth strewn with fragments of their lifeless forms, the Church of God stands alone, the living and life-giving among the dead. When and how these things shall be, we know not, but I also may say, in the words of our Divine Redeemer: 'There be some standing here who shall not taste death till they see the kingdom of God coming in power' "1

Twenty years have rolled by since these words were uttered, this sermon preached. The preacher has become, first, primate of the Church in England, and in the next place a cardinal and prince of the Holy Roman Empire. Great changes have occurred, and many of them altogether unforeseen. Fragmentary forms of Christianity have gone on falling piecemeal and resolving themselves into dust. The touch of death has been laid upon them, and they are obeying the law of their own nature. But now hostile forces have unfurled their banners and brought their artillery into the field. Infidelity in various shapes, agnostic, pantheistic, atheistic, has penetrated into every department of literature, reviews, daily papers, books, lectures, music-halls, temples, and its language everywhere is distrustful and defiant towards religion in general and in a special manner towards that of Rome. Yet we have no reason to suppose that the opinion of his Eminence is in any degree altered, or that he would use to-day language in any way at variance with that which he used in the introduction to his sermons of 1863. Nor can it be inappropriate here to quote the opinion of one whose position was and is so important, and who is, in fact, the leader and general under whose *labarum* we are bound to fight for the conversion of England and the overthrow of Satanic legions sworn to oppose the march and victory of the armies of Christ.

"There was a time," he then wrote, "when the conversion of Rome was humanly as hopeless as the conversion of England. Yet it was done; and it was done, not by the slow accretion of in-

<sup>1</sup> Sermons on Ecclesiastical Subjects, 1863, p. 438-40.



dividuals, as men build palaces or pyramids, but by an instantaneous act of power, as God laid the foundations of the earth, and rears the height of mountains. What more unlooked for than the decree which, all in one day, hung upon the columns of the Forum, — *Christianam religionem profiteri liberum*. And how wonderful and almost instantaneous, like a beautiful vision, was the rise and world-wide expansion of the peace and glory of pontifical Rome, the mother and mistress of all churches. So, in its proportion, there may also be a grace in store for England. For the blood of martyrs is not shed in vain, nor all the tears and prayers of widows and orphans, virgins and confessors, forgotten before the throne. A great and mighty intercession has been for centuries ascending for England. The times of its desolation will not last forever, nor has God forgotten to show mercy. The loss of its worldly splendor, by which it is now inflated and intoxicated, may, perhaps, be required as the price of its restoration. For, as it lost its true Christian glories by the growth of its worldly greatness, so, perhaps, a worldly humiliation may be the just divine condition to its rising again to the grace of the kingdom of God. But this may come as in one day when we least look for it, and in one day it may turn to the Lord 'when the vail shall be taken away' from its heart."

We shall be excused if, in the love of our country, we earnestly trust that the grace of conversion may, in its measure, be bestowed upon her without any national humiliation, which she has, no doubt, deserved. In the present century she has not been backward in endeavors to repair the severities of the past, and this merit at least will, we may hope and believe, be laid to her account. The Catholic Church has twice been established in England, and twice it has been swept away. The agency of kings and queens, chieftains and barons, was, doubtless, largely employed in bringing about both these happy events, but should it please God to visit this people a third time with His salvation, the influence of the crown and the nobles can no longer be looked to as all-important factors in the change. The examples of personages in high stations would undoubtedly have immense influence still, but their authority is on the wane, if not actually at an end. The power of the people grows more and more, and no national changes can be effected but as the result of their will or assent. This would, of course, make the return of England to the faith more difficult, but not by any means hopeless. The hearts of all are in the hands of the Lord, and He can sway masses and multitudes with as much ease as courts and cabinets. But for those whom He might honor as His agents and missionaries the labor would be greater and the resistance more formidable. Opponents will have to be convinced

one by one and catechumens multiplied, lest sudden enthusiasm should in many cases be mistaken for sound conversion. The great object will be to obtain not mere numbers, but steady recruits. "Your strength," Dr. Newman wrote, more than thirty years ago, "lies in your God and your conscience; therefore, it lies not in your number. It lies not in your number any more than in intrigue, or combination, or worldly wisdom. God saves, whether by many or by few."<sup>1</sup> What we need above all things is organization, edification, mental culture, and heroes of the cross—men of power, untiring zeal, and faith that removes mountains. We may, within thoroughly Christian limits, become hero worshippers. We may long and pray that great men may be raised up with a spirit and force of language which their adversaries cannot gainsay or resist; men equal to a rare occasion; men of keen vision, strong convictions, invincible resolve, and free from every kind of narrowness; men of prayer, and self-sacrifice, and, like Apollos, "mighty in the Scriptures."<sup>2</sup> Without such apostles, our work will be slow and unsatisfactory; with them, the walls of Jericho will fall as at the blast of trumpets. Such men cannot fight alone. Followers, both lay and cleric, will gather round them and love the very ground on which they tread. They will find a welcome in the palaces of princes, the seats of learning, the libraries of scholars, the halls of disputation, and the cottages of the poor. They will teach and preach not only from pulpits and altar-steps. It may be that the time will have come when ecclesiastical superiors will send them forth into the lanes and hedges to compel outsiders to come in that His house may be filled. They may, perhaps, follow with advantage and success the example of their Master, and preach to the people from the mountain-side or from the ship's stern. "Salvation Armies" of a right description may march in their wake and call down the blessings of Heaven with the well-trained voice of Catholic psalmody and hymns. The garments of monks and nuns will no longer scare a timid and prejudiced people, but rather will be signs and tokens of a diviner presence, solid virtue, and prevalent prayer. Weak and captive women before now have been sharers in a nation's apostolate. Theodoret<sup>3</sup> assures us that Iberia was taught the way of truth by a captive woman. "She devoted herself to prayer; she allowed herself no better bed than a sack spread upon the ground; and accounted fasting her highest enjoyment. This austerity was rewarded by gifts similar to those of the Apostles." She healed sick children by her prayers; she applied to the disease of the queen of the

<sup>1</sup> "Present Position of Catholics in England." Fourth edition, p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> Acts xviii. 24.

<sup>3</sup> "History of the Church," Book i., ch. 24.

country the same efficacious remedy; she meekly explained the Divine doctrine and exhorted the queen to erect a church in honor of Christ, who had healed her; she led her consort to acknowledge the power of the God she adored. He, too, prayed, and was enlightened. The edifice was completed according to the captive's plan, roofed in, and everything but the priests supplied. The admirable woman persuaded the king to send to the Roman emperor for the teachers of religion; nor was Constantine deaf to the embassy. Iberia was converted to the faith of Christ. And are there none of England's daughters—rather, are there not many—who will, by God's grace, imitate the prayer and exercise the gift of healing of this captive woman, and rival the faith of their own Pomponia Græcina, Claudia, and Bertha?<sup>1</sup>

It was the privilege of the writer, nearly two years ago, to be present at a crowded reception in the town mansion of the premier duke and duchess of the English peerage. The guests were invited neither to ball nor banquet, but to meet and offer their respectful homage to one who will, perhaps, hereafter be called the second apostle of England. What he really has been to us we shall not fully know while he lives—nor, indeed, till his voluminous and invaluable correspondence is published. On the occasion referred to, he was an old man, about eighty years of age, and had recently been invested with the purple of a Roman Cardinal. He had a kind word or some familiar talk for every one who was presented to him by one of his own chaplains or by the lord of the mansion, and his entire bearing was utterly devoid of the pomp of a newly-acquired dignity. Standing, as he did, in one of the thronged saloons, his presence there seemed highly suggestive, and a forecast of what might, perhaps, hereafter be seen in England on even a larger and a grander scale. It called to mind, by contrast even more than by likeness, the advent of Cardinal Pole when he entered his barge at Gravesend and proceeded slowly up the Thames, with his silver cross fixed in the prow;<sup>2</sup> and it led one to ask whether a day might not be in store for England when, not in a ducal mansion, but in a royal palace, or in some edifice occupied by the head and representative of the British government, a legate and Cardinal of the Holy See will, by some gracious document, some concordat, or other Pontifical act, reconcile Britannia to the centre of unity and attach her to the chair of St. Peter; not as a slave, for "Britons never will be slaves," but as a free, intelligent, faithful, and loving daughter. Diplomatic relations would then be restored as a matter of course, though there is really no reason upon earth why they should not be renewed at once, except that

<sup>1</sup> Lingard's "History of England," ch. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Lingard's "History of England," vol. vii., ch. ii.



the English legislature, at a period of considerable excitement, pledged itself not to receive an ecclesiastic as an ambassador from Rome—a distinction without a difference which is simply ludicrous.

And here it may be remarked, as not irrelevant to the present subject, that among the hopeful signs of England's return and of the mitigated feeling of hostility toward the Catholic Church throughout the land, must be reckoned the fact of the extraordinary respect with which Cardinal Newman is generally regarded. There is not another man in England who has secured to himself so large a number of friends and admirers as a Christian, a gentleman, a scholar, and a man of letters. The feeling of reverence towards him pervades all classes, sects, and schools of thought. Even those who have no religion beyond that of nature speak highly of Cardinal Newman; nor is it difficult to discover the reason why. He has been habitually honest and straightforward in dealing with his opponents; he has stated their arguments in the strongest way; he has replied, even when under provocation, without a touch of bitterness; and he has expressed dissent or disapprobation in polite or even friendly language. He has not distorted history to suit his own purpose, nor failed to corroborate his statements by exact references. He has given no encouragement to what is narrow-minded and persecutive, nor sought to infringe, in any way, the rights of conscience. His life has ever been in harmony with his writings, and he speaks as he writes. A singular testimony was given to his exalted character and his power of conciliating adversaries when, in that very University of Oxford which he had deserted, the President and Fellows of Trinity College paid him, to use his own words,<sup>1</sup> "the gracious compliment of making him once more a member of a college dear to him from undergraduate memories," invited him to pay them a visit, gave receptions in his honor, and hung his portrait, splendidly executed, in their common hall. Things are not now, thank God, exactly in the state in which they were after the "Papal Aggression." When lecturing, in 1851, on the position of Catholics in England, he said:<sup>2</sup> "At this very time, in consequence of the clamor which has been raised against us, children in the streets, of four and five years old, are learning and using against us terms of abuse, which will be *their* tradition all through their lives, till they are gray-headed, and have, in turn, to teach it to their grandchildren. They totter out, and lift their tiny hands, and raise their thin voices in protest against those whom they are just able to understand are

<sup>1</sup> Dedication of "Essay on Development." New edition, 1878.

<sup>2</sup> Lect. ii., p. 81.

very wicked and very dangerous, and they run away in terror when they catch our eye. Nor will the growth of reason set them right. The longer they live and the more they converse with men, the more will they hate us. The Maker of all, and only He, can shiver in pieces this vast enchanted palace in which our lot is cast. May He do it in His time!" More than twenty years have passed, yet the vast palace still stands; but it is in part disenchanted; much of its tawdry glasswork is broken, many of its wizards are silenced, and many of its colored lights put out.

We are told that germinal points, or bioplasts, are scattered pervadingly through all organic structures, and have the power of transmitting not-living into living matter; that they move, are self-multiplying, and constantly produce formed material,—nerve, bone, muscle, and artery. Thus our bodies are built up and renewed day by day. Nor is it otherwise in the body of the Church, and especially of a missionary Church like ours. It extends rapidly, in proportion to the number and vigor of its life-giving centres. It has been shown already, to a certain extent, how these centres have increased since the Oxford exodus under our modern Moses, and a few statistics must now be given as landmarks indicating, so far as external signs are concerned, the advance which has been made up to the present date. But before entering on these, one quotation bearing directly on the matter in hand may be made.

A few years ago "A Popular Defence of the Jesuits" gave the following account from information derived from the Provincial of the Order: "The English Jesuits are (1877) under a Provincial, and in his Province are included England, Scotland, Wales, Malta, Demerara, British Honduras, and, I believe, one or two other places abroad. The fathers under the English Provincial, engaged in mission work, number about 110, and some idea may be formed of their immense influence for good when I mention that I know I am well within bounds in saying that last year the mission priests of the society, in their churches and missions, had more than 380,000 persons approach the altar as communicants. . . . It is, as may be imagined, impossible to give the exact number of the conversions made in the course of the year, but last year over 500 were received into the Church. . . . In 1876 they had over 17,000 children in their (poor) schools, and this does not include those in British Honduras and other places which I mentioned as being under the English Provincial. With respect to the upper classes, there are five colleges for the education of the gentry, and in these five colleges there are, at this moment, over 1000 scholars."

Peers in England have a social influence which, in a republican country like the United States, would appear ridiculous. Their

political power has greatly diminished ever since the Reform Bill, and is even yet on the wane; but in society they are as potent as ever, and it is, therefore, no small advantage to the Catholic body here that they can point to one duke, two marquises, nine earls, four viscounts, and twenty-two barons as enrolled under their flag. Forty-seven Catholic baronets also occupy a middle position between peers and commoners. There are seventeen Catholic lords who are not peers, and six Catholic members of the Queen's Privy Council. There are fifty-five Catholics who are members of the House of Commons, including those who represent Irish constituencies, and a very large number of English Confessors abroad. The total number of Archiepiscopal and Episcopal Sees, Vicariates, and Prefectures in the British Empire is 135. In England and Wales the archbishops and bishops number 14; the priests, 2036; the churches, chapels, and stations, 1190. In Scotland there are 6 bishops and archbishops, 295 priests, and 286 churches, chapels, and stations. Westminster, Birmingham, and Shrewsbury have each an auxiliary bishop, and besides the archbishops and bishops holding office in Great Britain, there are four bishops and one archbishop retired or without office. The numbers given for churches, chapels, and stations in England, Scotland, and Wales, do not include such private or domestic chapels as are not open to the Catholics of the neighborhood. The colleges, schools, convents, institutions, societies, etc., would be too long to enumerate,—it would, indeed, be difficult to obtain a complete list of them,—but in their advertisements, published in the official directory, we find 41 colleges and boys' schools of the first order and 20 of the second; 98 convent-schools; 56 religious and charitable institutions and societies; 39 schools and institutions abroad.

Little, it is to be feared, can be gathered from reading these bare numbers; it is necessary to see and observe the zeal and kindness of the teachers and the diligence of the taught before any adequate idea can be gathered of the greatness of the work that is being done. The architectural beauty and the interior decorations of the buildings which recent Catholicity among us is raising to the glory of God have to be taken into account in any estimate we may form of the Church's advance or prospects. In comparison with the edifices which are now to be seen all over England, those which were built by our Catholic forefathers were mud hovels. They rival, and more than rival, those produced by the wealth of the Establishment and the numerical strength of dissent. They testify to both the zeal and influence of the faithful who built them, and they are pledges of evangelization and education stretching far into the distance of the future. As specimens of art they do honor to the men who learned first of the Camden Society and then of



the two Pugins, father and son. But do these hopeful signs in their entirety afford us any reasonable ground for expecting that England, as a nation, will return to the faith? There are many who think that they do not; that large as may be the remnant which will be gathered in, it will after all be but a remnant; that political forces hostile to the Church are gaining the ascendant; that the grounds of controversy are being entirely changed and are no longer concerned with the difference between Protestantism and the Catholic religion, but rather between revelation and total denial of God, providence, moral law, human responsibility, life after death, miracle, conscience, and prayer. "The conflict," they say, "which the Church will have to wage in this country, will be one altogether new in the world's history, and the common ground between her and her adversaries will be vastly diminished. When once the state shall cease, as the state is fast ceasing, to recognize any Christian principle, the nation will be further than ever removed from a return to Christianity in its highest and most complete form. To look for such a consummation is to indulge in dreams which facts are daily rendering more improbable. It is far more likely that she will herself be subjected to persecution, of which there have not been wanting signs in other countries of Europe. Principles are abroad moreover which tend to the dissolution of society itself, and the disintegration even of so great an empire as that of Great Britain is perfectly conceivable. As a nation she may have seen her best days, and before a very long period has elapsed she may cease to be a nation at all. A national return to the faith, therefore, is of all things least to be expected, but multitudes which no man can number, out of every nation and kindred and people and tribe owing allegiance at present to the British Crown, may, notwithstanding great and fundamental political changes, addict themselves to the Church of the Apostles and centre of ecclesiastical unity."

Thus it is that many who are by no means lacking in zeal for the interests of their religion, nor in confidence in the power of prayer, nor in efforts for the conversion of their non-Catholic brethren, express their opinions respecting England's return to the faith without the smallest wish to damp the hopes of those who take a less sombre view of the case. Nor would it be fair to dismiss this subject without alluding to a remarkable paper which was read by Bishop Patterson before the Academia of the Catholic religion in London, and afterwards published in the *Dublin Review*.<sup>1</sup> In this article his lordship gives his "reasons for not despairing of a national return to the faith." In the first place he adverts to the im-

---

<sup>1</sup> July, 1881.

proved condition of the Anglican Establishment, as compared with what it was under Queen Elizabeth, and as compared with that of other separatists of the sixteenth century. In the Caroline divines there was a marked improvement over those of the Socinian Reformation; and the Anglican church may be fairly said to have checked, if not eliminated, from herself, the so-called elements, by her own action in the century following. Erastianism received many deadly blows in the Oxford movement of the present century; and now High Church doctrine has prevailed over Low, and an extraordinary tendency is manifested towards the ideas and ritual implied by the words altar, sacrifice, and priesthood. These are hopeful signs even for us, for they will operate on the masses and prepare them for the reception of the Church's teaching on the holy sacrifice of the Mass. Secondly, Bishop Patterson dwells on the fact that there has been in the Establishment an extraordinary revival of church services and church frequentation, in addition to the remarkable tendency toward Eucharistic developments. The ancient churches of the land, now unfortunately in Protestant hands, have been marvellously renewed, enlarged, or rebuilt in imitations worthy of the grander faith; and the graves of the dead are now commonly surmounted by beautiful Christian symbols and inscriptions, breathing frequently the very hopes and faith of Catholics in reference to the departed. Thirdly, The religious movements of the last and present centuries represented by Wesley, Whitfield, Law, Venn, Wilberforce, Thornton, Simeon, and others, full as these defective movements were of zeal and earnestness, rendered the Oxford revival of primitive church doctrine possible by having stirred up in multitudes of minds a deep sense of spiritual need and faith in a personal and divine Redeemer. Wesley and Simeon, in some sense, frayed the way for Pusey and Newman, as they in turn, even when the latter was still an Anglican, led on towards conversion to the faith of Rome. Fourthly, Bishop Patterson lays much stress on the change which took place in the national literature as early as the beginning of the present century. The writings, he thinks, of Southey, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Walter Scott, notwithstanding much that they contained of an opposite tendency, rallied their countless readers round "the great ideal of Christendom, its chivalry, its high enterprise, its picturesque beauty, its soul-stirring mixture of a splendid and mysterious religion, with all the shifting accidents by flood and field that form the favorite ground whereon young imaginations delight to expatiate." Fifthly, Bishop Patterson reckons among one of the causes of England's probable return to the faith, the French and Irish migrations into England. The French Revolution cast a large number of bishops and pastors on our neighboring shores.

Scarcely a family of note and position throughout the land but received some of these exiles into its intimacy. Either as guests and inmates, or as laborious and successful teachers, they found access to the interior of that boasted fortress,—the Englishman's home. Eight thousand French ecclesiastics were sheltered among us; and to know them was to esteem and love them. In the sixth place, the bishop relies on the blood of martyrs as the seed of the Church in England, as it has been elsewhere, and firmly believes that the land which was so copiously watered with that fertilizing dew will certainly one day reap a great harvest from it. But, besides this, he thinks that a circumstance connected with the larger number of these martyrdoms affords a special ground for hoping that the harvest of conversions will take a national or political form. The circumstance to which his lordship refers is that almost all the Elizabethan martyrs, and those of the succeeding reigns also, expressed in their last moments ardent feelings of loyal adherence to the civil power, which they felt to be so cruelly misused. Certain it is that the Catholic gentlemen of the land fought bravely, or were ready to fight bravely, on the side of Elizabeth, at the time of the invasion of the Spanish Armada, and the majority of English Catholics disavowed any connection with the Guy Fawkes conspiracy in the following reign. Under his seventh head, the same prelate observes that, though the numbers of conversions are not by any means such as to establish a great hope of national return merely on the score of numbers, yet they belong mainly to the upper classes—to classes representing property, education, law, religion, legislation, and administration, to which may be added literature, science, and art. These constitute the great moral bodies and members of the state. This is no unimportant consideration, since "there are no people so accessible to aristocratic influence as the English, and no society in which so perpetual and wide a process of natural selection from the lower strata goes on constantly and rapidly." Bishop Patterson finds in the instincts of the faithful in all countries his eighth ground for hopes of a national return. Why men and women, who have had no personal knowledge of our country, or connection with her, have yet been moved to pray all their life long for her return. Among these were, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Maria Escobar and the lady Teresa de Carvajal in Spain, and in the last century St. Paul of the cross in Italy. The bishop refers also to the instincts of the Holy See in such acts as creating the hierarchy in 1850, and again nominating three Englishmen to the cardinalate at one time, and no less than eight English-speaking cardinals within our own memory. It is true that at the present time the extreme High Church, or ritualist school of Anglicans,



presents an aspect of apparently increasing hostility to the Catholic Church, but it is not to be expected that our progress should undergo no interruption. The hope of a national return is wrapped up in a gradual and, indeed, almost insensible extension to the whole people of a knowledge of Catholic doctrine, and among the causes by which so vast and momentous an occurrence is to be brought about we must reckon largely on the instrumentality of such as have operated and operate still outside the visible body of the Church. Lastly, it is to be observed that, in the various preparatory movements that have been touched upon, the *direct* influence of the visible Church has been remarkably absent. The Holy Spirit appears, for the most part, to have operated immediately on minds and souls, and to have brought them into the visible fold of Christ without the agency of priest or laymen of the Catholic community.

It is evident that these reasons are not all of equal weight. But they have undoubtedly a collective force, and are well worthy of consideration, for each adds strength to the other. If it be possible to entertain hopes of England's return in her national capacity, it is far better to do so, for faith and prayer are strengthened by the liveliness of hope, and the full assurance that what we hope for is feasible and probable. The bishop regards it as hardly possible that we should be destined to a national return without national humiliation, and asks whether our humiliation may not lie in this,—that every trace and vestige of our old Catholic polity is doomed to destruction before the new structure is to rise again. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the British Constitution—once the pride and admiration of Englishmen of every party—is surrounded by deadly enemies, ready to assail it openly when their hour shall come; and that with it many ancient institutions, religious and secular, landed, proprietary, and hereditary rights, would be overthrown and levelled with the dust; but it is difficult to imagine how this could contribute towards the national return of the land so humiliated to the faith of its ancient forefathers. A revolution so radical could not be effected without the consent of a majority, or the agency, at least, of a powerful minority, among the people; and these, in all probability, would be inspired with bitter hatred of the Catholic Church, and be composed of atheists and agnostics of every kind and degree. Extremes, it is true, produce extremes; in other words they provoke reactions, and nations, like individuals, may be near conversion when their wickedness and folly have advanced to its utmost bounds. The national return may be promoted by such a catastrophe as is here contemplated, but it is difficult to conceive how this could be. If the basis even of natural religion is compromised by a state and swept away,

what more can be expected for Catholicity than that a remnant—it may be a very large remnant—will be saved according to the election of grace?

It will be remembered that when Cardinal Newman was staying in London in May, 1880, he delivered an address to the Catholic Union on the Conversion of England. The tenor of that memorable address, from the beginning to the end, was undoubtedly to show that the conversion of England to the Catholic Church cannot properly have any other meaning now than “the growth of the Catholic Church in England.” “Catholics,” his Eminence said, “do not now depend, for the success of their religion, on the patronage of sovereigns,—at least in England,—and it would not help them much if they gained it. Indeed, it is a question if it succeeded here in England, even in the sixteenth century. Queen Mary did not do much for us. In her short reign she permitted acts, as if for the benefit of Catholics, which were the cause, the excuse, for terrible reprisals in the next reign, and have stamped on the minds of our countrymen a fear and hatred of us, viewed as Catholics, which at the end of three centuries is as fresh and keen as it ever was. Nor did James II. do us any good in the next century by the exercise of his regal power. The event has taught us not to look for the conversion of England to political movements and changes, and in consequence not to turn our prayers for it in that direction.”

These thoughtful observations, of so eminent a doctor of the Church, must not be taken as implying any tepid feeling in regard to the conversion of our countrymen. And with this idea in mind, it is interesting to turn to his sermon on the Second Spring, preached, not long after the “Papal Aggression,” in St. Mary’s, Oscott, in the first Provincial Synod of Westminster. “If it be God’s blessed will,” the preacher observed, “not saints alone, not doctors only, not preachers only, shall be ours, but martyrs, too, shall reconsecrate the soil to God. We know not what is before us ere we win our own; we are engaged in a great, a joyful work, but in proportion to God’s grace is the fury of His enemies. They have welcomed us as the lion greets his prey. Perhaps they may be familiarized in time with our appearance, but perhaps they may be irritated the more. To set up the Church again in England is too great an act to be done in a corner. We have had reason to expect that such a boon would not be given to us without a cross. It is not God’s way that great blessings should descend without the sacrifice first of great sufferings. If the truth is to be spread to any wide extent among this people, how can we dream, how can we hope, that trial and trouble shall not accompany its going forth? And we have already, if it may be said without presumption, to

commence our work withal, a large store of merits. We have no slight outfit for our opening warfare. Can we religiously suppose that the blood of our martyrs, three centuries ago and since, shall never receive its recompense? Those priests, secular and regular, did they suffer for no end? or rather for an end which is not yet accomplished? The long imprisonment, the fetid dungeon, the weary suspense, the tyrannous trial, the barbarous sentence, the savage execution, the rack, the gibbet, the knife, the caldron, the numberless tortures of those holy victims; O my God, are they to have no reward? Are Thy martyrs to cry from under Thine altar for the loving vengeance on this guilty people, and to cry in vain? Shall they lose life, and not gain a better life for the children of those who persecuted them? Is this Thy way, O my God; righteous and true? Is it according to Thy promise, O King of Saints, if I may dare talk to Thee of justice? Did not Thou, Thyself, pray for Thine enemies upon the cross, and convert them? Did not Thy first martyr win Thy great Apostle, then a persecutor, by his loving prayer? And is that day of trial and desolation for England, when hearts were pierced through and through with Mary's woe, at the crucifixion of Thy body mystical? Was not every tear that flowed, and every drop of blood that was shed, the seeds of a future harvest, when they who sowed were to reap in joy?" This extract is somewhat long, it is true, but who has a better right to speak and to be quoted, in other lands as well as his own, than the author, one might almost say, not only of the sermon, but of "The Second Spring" of which the sermon treats?

The prospect of England's return might be considered from a different point of view from any that has been taken in this article, namely, by adverting to the numerous admissions made by the enemies of the Church, or by persons who are, at any rate, outside her visible pale. These would form, in the aggregate, a most powerful testimony in her favor, would cover the whole ground of controversy, and vindicate her claims to reverence and obedience in each and all of her articles, and of her moral and disciplinary precepts. Not that it is anything new for the Church's adversaries to make admissions which glorify her, and often entirely stultify their own pretensions. But it is a new thing in England—for a long period the most anti-Catholic of nations—to light upon such admissions so frequently as we are now in the habit of doing. They meet us in every department of literature. Poets, dramatists, historians, orators, journalists, lecturers, preachers, novelists, essayists, astonish us by the light which has broken in upon their understandings, and frequently touched the deepest springs of feeling in the heart. This is more conspicuous in poetry than in any other branch of letters, for the simple reason that poetry is the



fruit of the imagination, and Catholic truth when developed as it is now being developed in England charms the imagination, and is in itself far more poetic than any spurious form of Christianity. Here is an extract which comes to hand at the moment of writing these lines, and is a good example of the admissions so frequently made in our favor. It is taken from a singularly attractive work entitled *Alps and Sanctuaries*, the author of which is not a member of the Church with which he has many sympathies: "When I say Catholics have logically the advantage over Protestants, I mean that, starting from premises which both sides admit, *a mere logical Protestant will find himself driven to the Church of Rome*. Most men as they grow older will, I think, feel this, and they will see in it the explanation of the comparatively narrow area over which the Reformation extended, and of the gain which Catholicity has made of late years in England."<sup>1</sup> If "a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump," what shall be said of the effect of abundant leaven of this kind in our current literature?

Before bringing this article to a close it may be well to recapitulate what has been said. We have spoken of John Henry Newman's final adieu to the Church of England in 1846, and its immediate effects; of the character and trials of the converts; the previous condition of Catholics in England; the zeal of Father Ignatius Spencer in exciting prayer for his country; the answers to his prayers and the consequences which followed; his mode of proceeding and his interviews with distinguished Protestants; the altered condition of England at present and the great increase of the Catholic body; the strength of adversaries and the tactics of free-thinkers; the fact of English Catholics not being hostile to science; the Bishop of Clifton on the attitude to be assumed towards scientific research; the scientific Catholics in England; Dr. Manning's account of Catholicity in England twenty years ago; his view at that time of England's return to the faith; the independence of that return on royal favor or aristocratic influence; the need of truly apostolic men; the example of a captive woman from Theodoret; Cardinal Newman at Norfolk House; the extraordinary respect with which his Eminence is generally regarded; the growth of the Jesuit fathers, with statistics respecting the actual numbers of bishops, priests, churches, etc.; the increased beauty of the churches; the causes that operate unfavorably towards England's return; a recent article by Bishop Patterson; his lordship's nine grounds for not despairing of England; return to the faith; the collective force of his reasons estimated; an address by Cardinal Newman on the same subject; an extract from a sermon by his Eminence on the

<sup>1</sup> *Alps and Sanctuaries of Piedmont and the Canton Ticino*, p. 140.

Second Spring, delivered at Oscott; and remarkable admissions of adversaries among us in relation to the Catholic Church. It is pleasing to think that our brethren on the other side of the Atlantic feel deeply interested in our condition and prospects, and we trust they will accept kindly a simple and unpretending attempt to supply a few materials towards forming a correct estimate of the subject.

---

### THE CINCINNATI PASTORAL AND ITS CRITICS.

THE discussion evoked by the Pastoral Letter of the Fathers of the Fourth Provincial Council of Cincinnati has wrought good, inasmuch as it has set men thinking upon the exact meaning of certain phrases, criticism of which has been deemed little short of high treason. Error largely springs from a misconception or misinterpretation of words; and it may be said of more things than liberty, that many crimes have been committed in their names. It is not the first time that the phrase "all men are created equal" has been challenged, and that, too, by Americans whose fealty to the Republic was above reproach; and we are at loss to understand why the Catholic Church should be assailed as disloyal, simply because the Fathers at Cincinnati said what must be evident to a little reflection.

But supposing for a moment that the prelates at Cincinnati condemned what has been grandiloquently but falsely termed "the fundamental principle of our government," does it follow that the whole Catholic Church stands committed to their declaration? By no means. The objectionable averments of the bishops occur in a pastoral letter, that is, a document which has not even the authority of the acts of the Council. The impression conveyed by the newspapers is that the Cincinnati Provincial Council is, in the language of one of them, "to Catholics of a defined region, what an ecumenical council is to the whole Church;" and "to reject this declaration is, for a Catholic, to reject his religion." Now, a provincial council is not an infallible body. It meets to discuss and regulate matters of local discipline. Its authority is limited to the province. Its acts are not authoritative until they have received the approbation of Rome.

But the pastoral letter forms no essential part of the conciliary

action. It is not legislative in form. It is simply an expostulation, or an instruction. It is what its name implies, the warning voice of the shepherds to their flocks. It is not a dogmatic document, and is not so regarded by the bishops. These would be the first to smile at the idea of confounding it with an article of faith.

It does not fall within the scope of this article, which deals only with an objection, to defend the Pastoral in detail. It suffices for a logician simply to overturn a position which has been unwarrantedly assumed. For Catholics, the Pastoral of the Prelates, placed "by the Holy Ghost to rule the Church of God," is worthy of all acceptance; and the document as it stands has, in fact, received the cordial approbation of thousands of well-meaning men who are not of the household of the faith. It is clear, however, that no room is given to the objections urged against it, when its true character, as an expository document, is presented.

So far, therefore, the attempt to impugn the loyalty of Catholics to this government, from certain passages in a pastoral letter, must fail. And, indeed, one would suppose that this devoted loyalty was at present placed far above question or controversy. Simple justice to the Catholic Church should make a man pause, even when he hears statements which appear to clash with a political maxim, before he wantonly accuses of treasonable doctrines, the members of a faith which has shown its loyalty in every epoch of American history. Why not calmly examine the reasoning of the Cincinnati prelates, and see in what sense they use words? It may be only a logomachy—a quarrel about words. Indeed, it will be found that the best Americans and the bishops are at one in meaning.

Following are the passages which have excited most comment :

"Nor are all men equal. Neither in mind nor body are men equal. In natural powers no two men are equal; nor with the same chances will any two men accomplish the same results. In the sense that God is no respecter of persons, and that Christ died for all, great and small alike, it is true all men are equal. It is also true that technically before the law it is assumed that all men are equal, yet in reality it is a well-known fact that men are not equal before the law. Wealth gives men a standing before the law that poverty has not; and, politically, the few control the many. This is in the nature of things, and must be, as it is ordained by God that some shall rule and some shall be ruled. Those who are appointed to rule have certain rights that subjects have not. Hence kings and magistrates, and bishops and priests, are appointed to rule; if to rule, then are they above those whom they rule. Before God their sins make them less than those they rule, but as rulers they are above those they rule. Besides this, talents and acquirements make men unequal, and thus one man succeeds where another fails. Without this there would be no motive for individual energy. It is hence untrue to say that men who have less physical or mental power are the equals of those who have more, or that all men's labor, whether mental or physical, is to be equally rewarded. Men should be paid according to the labor and skill they give; if more, they should receive more; if less, then they should receive less. Idleness and inability are not to be rewarded equally with labor and talent.



The cry of equality is the cry of the idle and the weak, but cannot, and will not, be admitted by the industrious and the strong."

\* \* \* \* \*

"With the popular doctrine that all men are equal, there is also steadily growing the doctrine that 'all power is from the people, and that they who exercise authority in the state do not exercise it as their own, but as intrusted to them by the people, and upon this condition,—that it may be recalled by the will of that same people by whom it was confided to them.' This is not Catholic doctrine, nor is it the doctrine of the Scriptures, which teach: 'By Me kings reign, . . . by Me princes rule, and the mighty decree justice.' (Prov. viii. 15, 16.) 'Give ear, you that rule people, . . . for power is given to you by God, and strength by the Most High.' (Wis. vi. 3, 4.) 'Let every soul be subject to the higher powers; for there is no power but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God.' (Rom. viii. 1.)

"While, on the one hand, the Catholic doctrine thus distinctly teaches that all power comes from God, we must not be understood as teaching that the people are not permitted a voice in the form of government under which they shall live; on the contrary, we teach with the Sovereign Pontiff Leo XIII., now gloriously reigning: 'That they who are set over the Republic may, in certain cases, be chosen by the will and decision of the people, without any opposition or repugnance to Catholic doctrine. By this choice the ruler is designated, but the rights of government are not conferred, and power is not given, but it is determined by whom it is to be wielded. There is no question here of the forms of government, for there is no reason why the rule of one or several should not be approved by the Church if only it is just and tends towards the common good. Accordingly, justice being observed, people are not forbidden to provide themselves with that kind of government which is most suitable to their genius or the institutions and customs of their ancestors.' " (Leo. XIII., June 29th, 1881.)

If, as a certain journal says, such a doctrine, carried to its logical conclusion, would result in the overthrow of the existing civil order, that civil order must be a great disorder. The Council simply states the obvious fact that men are born with very unequal capacities. It does not impugn the principle that every person has, by birth, the right to the equal protection of the law; that all persons stand equal before the law, both in liability and in protection. Nor have our institutions ever allowed the equal right of every person to govern. There has always been a governing class, which has determined how far the rest shall be admitted into it. All agree to exclude immigrants, until they have been here five years, with intent to become citizens. All exclude males under twenty-one, and all females. In some of the States citizens are excluded by property qualifications. The affirmation of the Constitution that the suffrage shall not be denied to any because of race and color, implies that it may be denied upon other grounds. Thus the action of the government is the best interpretation of the maxim of the Declaration of Independence concerning the sense in which "all men are equal." Our government has never allowed the equal right of every person to govern.

History and experience verify the statement of the fathers that it is in the nature of things that some shall rule and some be ruled. Even a mob will develop leaders. The most elaborate political institutions, designed to equalize the governing powers of all, cannot prevent certain men of force and ability from taking leadership.

It is the law of nature. Nay, it is the Divine order, and the most democratic state yields to this law with perfect willingness and confidence. Man may say that all are equal, but God and nature say no, and prove the "no."

We are under the impression that the reason why the Council inserted these remarkable declarations was precisely to bring about the discussion and examination of certain plausible phrases, of which the one under fire is a specimen. We cannot measure the force of a pithy sentence whether it embodies a truth or a falsehood. This is not the time or place in which to enter upon an analysis of the idea of liberty; but it is patent that the populace confounds it with license. The wild theories regarding government which prevail amid the revolutionists of Europe, are all sanctioned by the words liberty, fraternity, equality. It is well that this Republic should know that modern revolution looks to her as the champion of "liberty," and we may be called upon to define clearly what we mean by it. It seems to us that the fathers of the Cincinnati Council have expressed the true meaning of equality, as the government understands it, and as it manifests its meaning by its action.

Far from unsettling in the slightest the basis of government by teaching that all power is from God, the Council deserves the thanks of all citizens for boldly proclaiming this great truth. Can there be any more solid ground for obedience to law, love of country, respect for rulers, than the belief that "the powers that be are ordained of God?" The Council here strikes at the infidel teaching that man is not a social being; that law is only the strong hand upon the throat of liberty; and that government is only a social contract dissolvable at the will of the people. They who criticise this part of the Pastoral as tending to strip the people of their right to govern themselves as they please, probably forget their strenuous defence of the Northern States in putting down, as most unjustifiable rebellion, the formal declaration and organized endeavor of a very large minority of the people to establish a government of their own.

The critics of the bishops may rest assured that the prelates are quite as good American citizens as they are, and that, perchance, they have a sincerer and more intelligent love of the country than those who proclaim it most loudly. The bishops are men of affairs, of learning, and of prudence, and their position gives them opportunities of seeing the operation of false theories and opinions which are springing up in the land. The Republic in danger has no better friends than those who dare proclaim unpalatable truths, and the fundamental principles of rule, in the face of those who look upon government simply as a personal perquisite or a temporary arrangement.

## BOOK NOTICES.

THE LIFE OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER, Apostle of the Indies and Japan. From the Italian of *D. Bartoli and J. P. Maffei*. With a preface by the *Very Rev. Dr. Faber*. Ninth American from the last London edition. New York: P. O'Shea, Agent, 1882.

TRULY "God is wonderful in His saints." They are examples at once of weakness and of strength; of the weakness of human nature, and of the strength and power of divine grace. Among them are to be found types of every variety of human nature under the most various and different circumstances, and types of men and women conquering in that nature every variety of sinfulness, and attaining to perfect virtue and sanctity under every form, by constant correspondence with divine grace and by bringing their own wills into perfect subjection to the divine will.

Yet while this is the great general lesson which the lives of the Saints teach us, there are other subsidiary or special, yet exceedingly important and salutary lessons that may be learned from a study of individual persons among them. These special lessons have special significance too for instruction, warning, encouragement, and edification to particular persons and in particular times and countries.

This is in entire accordance with the spirit of the Sacred Heart, the life of the Church. As the author of the work before us beautifully and truthfully says, "She does not sit still, unchangeable as she is; she clothes herself in every age with mutability; and her changes are akin to the changes of the restless world itself. She goes forth to seek sinners. She speaks to them in a language which they well understand. She undermines by her sweet varieties the fortresses which the world has built to all but her. Thus she in a measure copies the times, and takes the world for her model, that she may the better conquer it for Christ."

Thus, "like to a master of a house who bringeth forth out of his treasure new things and old," the Church continually sets forth her treasures of truth in such form and array as are best calculated to attract the sincere and single-minded, to encourage the fearful, to confirm in true faith the believing, to edify the devout, to rebuke the froward, to convict the unbelieving of their folly, and to confute and confound the propagators of false doctrines. And so too, in accordance with this same principle in the wonderful providence of God, saints are produced and trained up in His Church, whose peculiar character and virtues, whose mission and work, fit them specially for combating and overcoming special sins, special errors, and special obstacles to true religion, and whose lives and examples thus become special sources of instruction and edification for special times and circumstances.

With such ideas in mind, the author of the volume before us has prepared it. In his opinion, a knowledge of the life and character and achievements of St. Francis Xavier is well adapted to fall in with the peculiar character of the present age and to direct aright its peculiar spirit. He describes its spirit as distinctively enthusiastic, uncongenial as such a spirit may seem at first thought to be, with the marked materialistic pursuits of our age. He says: "It may be doubted if ever men were more enthusiastic than they are now. The times are positively full of enthusiasms. They are partly material and partly intellectual. There are enthusiasms in science; enthusiasms in literature; enthusiasms in politics; enthusiasms in geographical discovery, and enthusiasms in com-



merce." All men are at work aiming at great things, believing in their own aims, with all their souls, minds, and hearts in their endeavors. They spare no expense, no effort, no sacrifices, to achieve their aims. Nothing appears to them impossible. They seem to have agreed among themselves that there is nothing impossible, and to be bent on proving it.

This is the lesson the world is teaching all who listen to it. It must be met by a like yet higher counter lesson taught by Christians. Among the countless enthusiasms of the day there must be held up conspicuously, to be seen and known by all, the higher, purer, nobler enthusiasm of living and being entirely for God. It must be a sober, steady, quiet enthusiasm; yet, for all that, a hearty, earnest, energetic enthusiasm, that shows its persistence of purpose and its intense, whole-souled devotion to God, as plainly, as unmistakably, as the enthusiasm of the world shows its earnestness in pursuit of material and intellectual objects. It must also be thoroughly practical, shaping itself to the work it seeks to perform, and judiciously choosing the means, the way, the methods, and instrumentalities best adapted to the achievement of its glorious object. The life of St. Francis Xavier teaches too where this true, steady, ardent, Christian enthusiasm must begin, how it must first show itself, and how it must be sustained. It must begin in the sanctification of our own souls. It is a fire which must burn inwardly before it burns outwardly; a fire that must be continually fed by constant, closest communion with God, by entire self-abnegation and self-mortification, and entire devotion to God. St. Francis Xavier clearly shows in his life and labors and wonderful success what one man can do who is all for God, and who has begun by sanctifying himself, and then keeps within his own appointed sphere. The very sobriety and obedience of his enthusiasm kindles his fervor rather than stifles it. It is the characteristic of his enthusiasm to neglect no means of grace, and to find an especial means of grace in living in an unbelieving country. It quickens his faith; it confirms his hope; it enlivens and enlarges his charity. His zeal was increased by it, and by the sights and sounds of unbelief and restless misbelief, of worldliness and luxury and immorality that met him everywhere, in India, Japan, and the Asiatic Islands, throughout his whole mission, among worshippers of idols, adherents of false religions, schismatics, heretics, and lukewarm and immoral Catholics.

Of all this, as the author of the volume before us clearly portrays, St. Francis Xavier was a perfect model. He was the very type of a Christian enthusiast. What men now are for physical sciences, for new branches of commerce, for intellectual and political novelties, that St. Francis Xavier was for the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ—entirely absorbed, entirely devoted. The work too which he had to do in his day resembles in a number of very striking particulars the work Christians have to do now. He had to confute and confound the propagators and defenders of false philosophies and false religions; to convert to the true faith pagans, infidels, and Mohammedans. He had also to rebuke and warn, arouse, excite to contrition, and lead into a better and purer life bad and corrupt Catholics. The countries in which he labored were filled with and abounded in such Catholics, and they, along with infidels, pagans, and Mohammedans, were sunk in spiritual sloth, corrupt in their morals, and devotees to wealth, to ambition, luxury, and effeminacy.

It is a picture of our own times. Subtle principles of infidelity, novel and fallacious philosophies, old errors revived under new forms, unbelief and disbelief in Christianity, doubts whether truth has even an existence, contempt for authority, defiant disobedience and lawlessness, shameless

immorality prevail everywhere. We are living, too, in an age of extreme effeminacy akin to what St. Francis Xavier in his day found throughout the East. Personal comfort, an inordinate worship of health and wealth and personal ease, of ambitious display, of dress, of grand mansions luxuriously furnished, of showy equipages, sumptuous tables, troops of servants, false mental refinement, the worship of mere material beauty, lust for power and human honors—these are the distinguishing characteristics of our age. And these vices and sins are not confined to those who are outside the Church. They weaken and corrupt and alienate from God hundreds of thousands of those who by baptism and education, by belief and profession, and, to some extent by practice and life, are Catholics. It is not necessary to look beyond our own country for proofs of this sad, this terrible state of society; but England, France, Germany, Spain, and Italy, and in fact every so-called Christian country, are all in like condition.

To break down and reform this deplorable state of society; to reconvert it and renew it by infusing into it the spirit of true religion; to win souls to Christ from unbelief, from belief in false religions; from bitter, intense hatred of the true religion and Church; from pride, ambition, luxury, and sensuality; to excite her own children to more consistency of conduct, more humility and obedience, more zeal, wider and livelier charity, greater virtue, and a more ardent and intense devotion, is the work of the Church to-day. And to this work she needs as instruments men who will take St. Francis Xavier as their saintly pattern and exemplar.

This is the great lesson of the volume before us, in which the author with full details clearly portrays the youth and manhood, the education and training, the heroic virtues and sanctity, the superhuman labors, the countless miracles, the marvellous spiritual conquests and success in winning millions of souls from the bondage of Satan to the kingdom of God, of St. Francis Xavier. The work is intensely interesting throughout. The author wields an eloquent pen, and his accounts of the condition of the countries in which St. Francis Xavier labored, the difficulties he encountered, the means he employed to overcome them, his self-abnegation, his mortification of himself, his burning zeal, and intense love for souls, his wonderful miracles and other scarcely less wonderful achievements, his death and burial, and the evidences of his sanctity, are masterpieces of clear and powerful narration and description.

---

PROTESTANTISM AND THE CHURCH.—Lectures delivered in St. Ann's Church, on Sunday evenings of Advent, 1881. By the Rt. Rev. Monsignor T. S. Preston, V.G., LL.D., Domestic Prelate to His Holiness Leo XIII. New York: Robert Codrington, 1882.

Though modestly called "lectures" by Monsignor Preston, and preserving the popular style of lectures, the contents of this volume are really logical and scholarly treatises on their respective subjects. The author's general purpose is to show that "the external communion of the faithful under one head (the Catholic Church) *is* the Church which Jesus Christ founded;" that "the Reformation, with all the systems it has engendered, denies the existence of that Church, and is, therefore, notwithstanding all its appearances of piety, the enemy of God and His Christ;" that individuals stand or fall before their invisible and omniscient Judge, who will render to every man according to his works; but that systems of falsehood and the founders of such systems are already condemned by the invariable truth of the one Teacher and Redeemer of mankind."

In accordance with this plan the author shows and proves in his first lecture the Divine institution of the Christian Church. He proves this by showing, first, that our Divine Lord did institute a Church. Secondly, he points out the characteristics of this Church—unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity—and proves that these characteristics are essential to the very existence of the Church of Christ. Third, he exhibits and explains the principal promises made by Christ to His Church. Fourth, he shows that the facts of history are in perfect accordance with these promises. And, fifth, that the Catholic Church and Christianity are synonymous in idea and in fact. These different points are set forth with great clearness and power, and are supported by numerous quotations from the Sacred Scripture, and from the early Church Fathers. The facts of history referred to are happily chosen and arranged, and their significance and bearing upon the argument lucidly exhibited.

The second lecture, entitled "The Reformation and the Church," shows that the Protestant movement is essentially an attack upon divine revelation and upon Christian faith. The argument is, briefly, that "the Church is the most sacred work of Jesus Christ, His body, the company of those who are substantially united to Him, to which He has promised perpetual life and victory;" that His whole mission on earth is identified with this Church, which represents Him to men and teaches His revelation; that "the religious movement of the sixteenth century, commonly called the Protestant Reformation, began with an attack upon this Church, lives by opposition to her doctrines, and has led to the denial of any Church whatever;" that thus all faith in One Holy Catholic Apostolic Church has been eliminated from the Protestant creed, and the result is the total subversion of Scripture, history, and Christianity; that such a movement, resulting in the destruction of the Church, the most necessary and holy institution of Jesus Christ, cannot be from God; that the Protestant Reformation is such a movement, and is consequently proved to be the enemy of revelation and the Christian faith.

In the prosecution of this argument the author shows how all of the so-called Reformers and their followers invariably attacked the Church, and proves by copious quotations from their writings the virulent and diabolical character of their opposition to the Church, the Papacy, the Episcopacy, the Priesthood, the Sacraments, and the chief doctrines of the Church. The quotations from Protestant writings will be valuable for reference to persons who have neither the sources within reach for obtaining them nor the leisure to collect them. The present Protestant doctrine concerning the Church is then stated, and an analysis made of this doctrine, showing that it substantially and necessarily involves a denial of the existence of the Church of Christ, and is in opposition to the facts of Christianity. The argument is plain, direct, and invincible.

Having thus shown what the Church is, and that all the organizations to which Protestantism has given birth have rejected the doctrine and the fact of One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and thus are guilty of attempting to subvert the work of His hands and the foundation against which He declared the gates of hell should not prevail, the author in his third lecture examines and shows the untenability of "the Anglican theory of the Church;" a theory which, in the face of the plain testimony of history, contends that Protestant Episcopalianism is not one of the offsprings of Protestantism, but of Catholicity, and which insists that their so-called church, though it is involved in all the errors of Protestantism, and has entirely rejected the communion of the Apostolic See, yet has never separated itself from the Church which our Divine Lord founded. Despite their schism entirely severing them from



the Catholic unity, and despite their denial of Catholic doctrine and their adhesion to numerous heresies, they nevertheless set up the claim to being a *branch* of the Catholic Church.

In his examination of this illogical and unhistorical theory, Monsignor Preston first shows from unquestionable historical testimony that the original growth of the Anglican Church flatly contradicts the pretensions of Anglicans. To show this he has made a full and very valuable collection of historical proofs, taken chiefly from the writings and declarations of Cranmer and others who were most active in promoting and completing an entire separation from the Holy Roman See, extracts from acts of Parliament, from royal proclamations, quotations from the oaths required of bishops, clergy, and others, including the oaths of supremacy, quotations from the declarations of "bishops," created by Elizabeth, and of Anglican convocations. These, together with the statements of Protestant historians, form an array of historical evidence which proves beyond all possibility of successful dispute that the Anglican Establishment had its origin in its total separation from the unity of the Church, and in making the English crown to be the acknowledged source of all spiritual authority and power to the Anglican bishops and clergy.

The author then directs attention to three peculiarities of the Anglican system: 1, Its character as an Establishment of the state; 2, Its twofold aspect as of a compromise between Catholicism and Protestantism; and 3, Its insincerity in its maintenance of divergent and opposite doctrines. Each of these the author clearly and plainly brings to view. His fourth point is, the "*absurdity* of the *branch* theory of the Church." His exposition of this is full and complete.

The fourth lecture is on the Catholic doctrine of the Church. In this lecture the author shows: 1, The nature of the Christian Church as a divine society; 2, The characteristics of its constitution; 3, The nature of its unity; 4, The sanctity which flows from its nature; 5, The ends which the Church accomplishes; 6, The sphere of its operations. The author's own lucid explanations and arguments are enforced and enriched with numerous quotations from the Fathers of the Church.

The work is one calculated to do great good among Protestants who are sincerely inquiring and searching for the truth, and also among lay Catholics who desire to be instructed on the chief vital points of controversy between themselves and Protestants. To the Catholic clergy also it will be valuable as a very complete collection and array of historical proofs, bearing on the different subjects discussed, taken from original sources.

---

A HANDBOOK OF CHARITY ORGANIZATION. By the Rev. S. Humphrey Gurteen. Buffalo: Published by the Author, 1882.

The author of this book tells us in the preface that it owes its publication "to the fact of the widespread interest which is being felt in every section of the country in the movement which is commonly known as charity organization." "From all parts of the United States," the author says, he is "constantly in receipt of letters asking for information with regard to the new plan for dealing with pauperism and poverty;" that "at first it was a simple matter to reply by sending the pamphlets, leaflets, forms, etc., which had been adopted by the Buffalo Society," but that most of these are now out of print, or are printed only for office use; and that the demand for information respecting details "referring to the mode of starting a charity organization society,

the exact functions of the central and district offices and their mutual relations, the duties of the district agent and the volunteer visitor," which had never been exactly "described in any of the Society's publications," made "the task of writing *A Handbook of Charity Organization*" one which "seemed to meet a real want of the present day."

The work is an elaborate one as respects details, and if charity could be reduced to mere routine work and made a matter of mere mechanical action, calculated, measured, and mapped out with mathematical accuracy like the different parts of a steam-engine, and kept moving with like soulless, rigid adherence to mechanical rules, it would be a valuable book.

As it is, it is a striking illustration of how *not* to be charitable, and *not* to do its real work or fulfil its objects. If any one wishes to see how under name and pretence of "charity" its divine and heavenly spirit can be entirely excluded from organizations professedly intended to benefit the poor and succor the distressed, he can find a truthful account of it in this book. Those of our readers who are familiar with "Mr. Gradgrind," as depicted by Dickens, will find his ideas actualized and reduced to a system in its pages. If it were entitled "a handbook of an organization to degrade the poor and punish poverty as an ignominious crime," its title would accord perfectly with its spirit and contents. It is full of directions to volunteer and district agents, how to "show a real interest in the poor and obtain their confidence," by questioning them minutely as to their circumstances and necessities, advising cleanliness and neatness and saving, with reiterated cautions never to extend assistance by donations of money or anything else until their character, personal history, antecedents, and habits have been searched into, ascertained, and reported upon to the central organization. A more perfect system of how to humiliate the sensitive, and keep at a distance the deserving poor, and those whose self-respect remains despite suffering and destitution, could not well be conceived. An inquisitorial process is instituted, such as no criminal is subjected to, into all the privacies of the family relations and social and personal life of every applicant for relief before relief is administered, and the results of this inquisition, with all their details, are recorded in the books of the central "organization," and copied and recopied into the books of the subsidiary or district organizations.

We have been amused and disgusted and filled with indignation at the manner in which the writer, in his chapter on "Charity and the Church," gabbles about St. Paul's "practical common sense" and "worldly wisdom," as displayed in rules he lays down respecting almsgiving. In proof that St. Paul's teachings respecting "charity" inculcate the principles and system we have been describing, the author actually quotes St. Paul's declaration that "if any man have not care for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." In the latter part of this strange chapter, however, he unwittingly strips his grand scheme of "charity organization" of all pretence even to real charity, by declaring that it makes no effort to console "sorrows which wring the very heart of mankind," or "alleviate sufferings, . . . in comparison with which the direst bodily wants sink into insignificance;" that "*with this*, the heavenly side of charity, *the proposed society has no concern*, but leaves it to the Church." Under the plea of aiding the Church, and of saving the Church "from wasting her alms upon paupers," he proposes that she shall surrender to his routine, soulless "organization" the work of relieving destitution and misery.

SCIENCE AND SKEPTICISM: A Study of Some Principles which Influence Modern Thought. By *Stephen M. Lanigan*. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son; London: Burns & Oates.

This work treats of what may be summed up in the popular phrase, "modern scientific thought." It lucidly points out and very thoroughly refutes its leading sophisms, under the several titles of the Tendency of Scientific Thought; Assumptions of Modern Physiologists; the Origin of our Knowledge; the Philosophy of Locke; the Philosophy of Hume; Theory of Causation; the Philosophy of Kant; Mental Laws and Conditions.

In his introductory chapter the author shows with great clearness and force the chief reason why the theories of agnosticism, sensualism, and skepticism have become so popular. The reason is that it pleases the generality of men to adopt them. They are popular not from any positive belief in their truth, but from the hope that they may be true. "They have all this in common, that they either directly or indirectly combat the notion of a modern governor of the world and a state of rewards and punishments hereafter. This is really the question which makes a slight knowledge of metaphysical science so interesting to mankind, and gives a certain interest to modern physical research. . . . Hence arises the contest between the professors of modern physical science and those who uphold the doctrines of revealed religion, which is carried on with so much animosity by the former as to make it appear that their object is less to establish truth than to overthrow all religious belief amongst mankind."

In the following remarks the author briefly but forcibly refers to the destructive tendency of this spirit: "To aid them in this contest, modern scientific men, in their blind rage against religious belief, have invoked, in their adoption of the skeptical philosophy, a power which does more harm to the advancement of science than injury to their adversaries. They do not see that the skeptical philosophy of Hume, carried to its legitimate conclusion, is far more destructive of any theories depending on the facts of human observation than of religious belief. The spirit of skepticism, when summoned to the aid of physical science, in antagonism to religion, like the demon in the German legend, destroys the enchanter who invoked it; and the reason is this, because the doctrine of disbelief is subversive of all human knowledge on any subject; because it demands 'certainty where only probability can be had,' and absolute knowledge in man's present intellectual condition is denied him." . . .

The following remarks from the commencement of the author's criticism of the assumption, by Huxley and other physicists, of the part of metaphysicians will be of interest: "Had Professor Huxley . . . proposed to write a sketch of the life and opinions of . . . some celebrated man in his own profession, the reader would accept his opinions on questions relating to the progress of surgical skill with all the respect which on such subjects he has a right to claim. But when he ventures on the domain of metaphysical speculation, the reader, who is not completely ignorant of the study, is unpleasantly reminded of the story of the Greek sculptor and the professional man who had an accurate knowledge of the anatomy of the human foot. In this there is no disrespect meant to the author. It is only asserted that his great attainments in the investigation of physical phenomena were not realized without the exercise of absorbing attention, which left him neither time nor opportunity to acquire a knowledge of metaphysics, such as to entitle him to the same respect for his opinions on that subject as is accorded to them on matters of physical investigation. There cannot be two sciences more essentially



different in their subject-matter, in their mode of investigation, and in the particular *character of intelligence required for the study of each*, than the science of mind, and the science of body. The one deals with the phenomena of our own consciousness, the other with the phenomena of the material world without us," etc.

We cannot follow the author farther into the body of his work. It keenly dissects the theories it criticises, separates whatever of truth they contain from their errors and fallacies, and lucidly and logically exposes and refutes the latter. The style is that of simple, pure English, and the work throughout is interesting and valuable.

ALL FOR LOVE; OR FROM THE MANGER TO THE CROSS. By the *Rev. James J. Moriarty, A.M.*, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, Chatham, N. Y., and author of "Stumbling-Blocks made Stepping-Stones," etc. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, 1882.

THIS work is not intended for the use of theologians, but of general readers. It is written, therefore, in popular style, and presents the thoughts it contains in such form as will most readily reach and impress ordinary minds.

As the author well remarks in the opening pages of his volume, the life of our Lord and Saviour is "so full of wonders, and so infinitely rich in all that is precious in thought and feeling, that no two men ever considered it from absolutely the same point of view or ever treated it precisely in the same manner. . . . Each man can enter on the field of exploration and investigation without fear of encroachment on another. . . . What is required is for each to enter upon his work with the credentials of earnestness and good faith, with a calm mind disposed for meditation, a prayerful industry, and a sincere desire to extract from the precious ore of God's Word what is needful for the spiritual enlightenment and refreshment of his immortal soul." And, along with all this, the study of the life of our Adorable Redeemer must be constantly prosecuted under the guidance of the infallible teachings of the Church which He founded.

In the prosecution of his plan, the author divides his work into seven chapters, respectively, entitled: "The Son of Man;" "The Son of God;" "A Voice from the Manger;" "The Hidden Life;" "Unfolding his Mission;" "Love's Banquet;" "Love's Sacrifice."

In the first of these chapters the wonderful condescension of God is dwelt upon, in humbling Himself to the extent of becoming man. The writer shows what this comprehends and the immense infinite sacrifice it involved, and then passes on to speak of how, as true, perfect man, our Divine Lord had the same human feelings and affections as we have, was clothed with our weaknesses and infirmities, sin excepted. Our Saviour's human affection and love for His home, His country, His relatives in the flesh, His race, His chosen friends; His sympathy with the weak, the fallen, and the suffering are well delineated.

The author then turns to the consideration of those features of our Saviour's life and character which demonstrate His divinity. He first exhibits and examines the testimony which our Lord Himself bore to His own divinity, in His declarations as recorded in the Gospels. Rationalists, who admit that Christ was a model man, the type and exemplar of truth, sincerity, and of every human virtue, are shut up to the alternative of admitting His divinity on His own testimony, or else of asserting that he was self-deceived. But their own acknowledgments of His profound wisdom and penetration utterly exclude the idea of self-delusion

or self-deception. The testimony of the Apostles is then adduced, particularly that of St. John and of St. Paul. Then, in proper order, the inferential proofs furnished by the miracles, the prophecies, the resurrection of our Lord, the growth, power, and indestructibility of His religion and Church are dwelt upon.

Having thus exhibited our Saviour as true man and true God, the author turns the attention of his readers to Him as the Babe of Bethlehem, and points out the lessons which devout meditation upon that theme suggests. He then endeavors to penetrate behind the veil which hides from human view our Saviour's life until His entrance upon His public ministry, and from the few and brief allusions to it in the Gospels and in the sacred traditions of the Church, to picture it as devout imagination and meditation may picture that "hidden life."

In the chapter entitled "Unfolding of his Mission," the testimony and mission of St. John the Baptist are explained as introductory and preparatory to our Saviour's entrance on His public ministry. The first miracle, the changing of water into wine, at the suggestion of His holy mother at the marriage feast at Cana of Galilee; His first public appearance before His fellow-citizens at Nazareth, and His discourse to them in the synagogue on the Sabbath-day, are appropriately commented on. The further unfolding of our Saviour's mission is then explained and beautifully shown by references to His discourses and miracles and acts of mercy. His special love for the poor and sympathy with the suffering are dwelt upon; His commendations of meekness, humility, purity, and charity; His denunciations of hypocrisy, cruelty, oppression, and injustice, and the influence of His teaching and example in all subsequent ages in ameliorating, purifying, and elevating all the relations of mankind, social and political.

The author then sketches the Apostles as they naturally were, men ill-fitted, from a mere human point of view, for the work our Saviour called them to do,—“illiterate, rude of speech, rough of manners, and very slow of understanding,”—and the infinite patience which our Divine Lord exercised towards them; how He gradually opened their minds, and instructed, trained, and prepared them for the sublime mission which he committed to them and their successors in office to do throughout all following ages.

The writer then exhibits and explains our Saviour's declarations and promises respecting the establishing of His Church; the authority and powers with which He has invested it; its adaptation in all respects for the ends of its institution and the purposes it is to accomplish, and also the evils and deadly sins of heresy and schism. Then, by way of contrast, he points out the utter powerlessness of Protestantism to supply the spiritual wants and cure the ills which the religion of Christ is designed and appointed to supply and cure.

In the next chapter, under the title of "Love's Banquet," the author dwells upon the Holy Eucharist, the time and circumstances and manner of its institution; the infinite condescension and excess of divine goodness it exhibits, and what it comprehends. At some length he explains and proves the doctrine of the Church respecting transubstantiation and the real presence, by quotations from the Sacred Scriptures and from the fathers and doctors of the Church.

The last chapter, entitled "Love's Sacrifice," is a devout description and meditation upon the passion and death of our Lord and Redeemer, depicting the agony that preceded, and the insults and contumely, the ignominy and mortification, the terrible tortures and suffering He endured, with sublime patience and humility, during His trial and cruci-



fixion ; the blessings thus obtained for mankind, and the lessons which we should learn from the history of our Saviour's sacrifice of Himself for us.

The writer's descriptions are clear and strong ; the meditations and lessons inculcated are edifying and highly suggestive to a devout mind, and the work throughout is calculated to exert a highly salutary influence.

EPITOME EX GRADUALI ROMANO QUOD CURAVIT SACRORUM RITUUM CONGREGATIO REDACTA, a F. X. Haberl. Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: F. Pustet, MDCCC-LXXXII.

OFFICIUM MAJORIS HEBDOMADÆ, A DOMINICA IN PALMIS USQUE AD SABBATUM IN ALBIS. Juxta Ordinem Breviarii et Missalis Romani cum Cantu pro Dominica Palmarum, Triduo Sacro et Paschate, quem curavit S. Rituum Congregatio. MDCCCLXXXI. Ratisbonæ, Neo Eboraci et Cincinnati: F. Pustet.

THE Epitome of the Roman Gradual is indispensable to all choirs, and we are glad to learn that they are yearly increasing that use the Gregorian Chant of the Mass. This Epitome contains all that is necessary for the generality of choirs whose services are limited to Sundays and to holydays of obligation. It also contains those festivals of saints who have a *commune*. The introduction treats briefly of the proper manner of using the Gregorian Chant. There is also given a full collection of the different tones, and the whole is in a compact shape, beautifully printed, and low in price. Those choirs into which the Ecclesiastical Chant has not as yet been introduced will find the Epitome highly useful in its directions for the proper mode of singing the responses at High Mass and other solemnities.

THE Office for Holy Week is an exact reprint of the edition prepared by the Sacred Congregation of Rites. With this book and a little training there is no reason why every church may not carry out the ceremonies of Holy Week as directed by the Church. The Passion Chants are of a simple and easy melody, and priests, who have trained a band of even laymen to sing, pronounce the experiment a success. This Office contains all the masses and services from Palm Sunday to the Saturday before Easter. The type is clear and bold, the notes well formed and remarkably accurate, and the size and shape of the book very convenient. We cordially recommend this, as we indeed do all of Pustet's liturgical publications, to the kind notice of the reverend clergy and to all interested in sacred music.

ORIGINAL SHORT AND PRACTICAL SERMONS FOR EVERY FEAST OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL YEAR. (Three Sermons for every Feast.) By F. X. Wenninger, S.J., D.D. Cincinnati.

This volume is supplemental to that containing Father Wenninger's *Sermons for Every Sunday of the Ecclesiastical Year*, and, along with it, completes the reverend author's plan. The two together are intended to form a full and systematic series of plain, practical, and brief sermons for the use of clergymen, for the term of three years, whose duties prevent them from commanding the time necessary to the preparation by themselves of original sermons.

Father Wenninger states in his preface that the volume before us is "intended for circulation in Europe as well as in America," and, therefore, "contains sermons appropriate not only for the feasts kept here, but likewise for those which in greater numbers are observed in Europe and other transatlantic countries."







